Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per copy (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 1956 W. Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-24 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Missouri.

Volume 61 St. Louis, Mo. November 1, 1933

NATIONALISM AND RELIGION

By Theophil Menzel

The world has moved beyond the point where our subject can be regarded merely as a subject for an academic debate. Any man who tries to appraise the social forces which play upon his life will be violently confronted with this question. And he will feel the impact of it, not merely as a member of society, but also as a religious man—unless, of course, he be so naive that he is not conscious of the conditions under which he is trying to be religious.

The increase of nationalistic sentiment is one of the characteristic features of modern history. During the War some of us felt how this creates a tension in regard to Christianity, and most of us who did not realize it then, have since come to feel the conflict into which every man is placed who is both a Christian and a citizen of a nation. And no doubt this problem will be intensified as both modern nationalism and Christianity become more and more conscious of their own nature.

But it is not a question which is peculiar to Christiany alone, although Christianity may possess more social awareness than some other religions. People of every religion are faced with the same conflict, if contact with other nationalities is direct enough to make nationalism self-conscious. There are three attitudes, it seems to me, which religions have taken to nationalism and to culture and social life in general. 1) Some religions have taken a more or less negative attitude to culture in general. But man must live in the world as long as he lives at all, so this attitude cannot be carried through consistently. Man cannot get out of the world, but he may hide himself in a sphere of his own, like Jonah in his bower on

the hill-top. Religions of this type place a great emphasis upon asceticism, and the whole ethic of the religion is apt to be ascetic in character. The world is evil; don't live in it, but merely keep along the outer fringes of man's activity. Perhaps Buddhism has embraced this attitude, not entirely, of course, but to a large degree. The representative man of this type is the monk. 2) Other religions take a completely affirmative attitude to the culture in which they find themselves. Religion so unreservedly accepts and promotes national life that it is difficult to know whether we are dealing with a patriotic cult or a religion. Religion becomes an auxiliary motor of nationalistic ambition, or rather, it is prostituted by nationalism. Shintoism is a clear example of this type. In such national religions, the political leader tends to become a God. Other such religions were later Roman religion, Babylonian, etc. It is no accident that in ancient Babylonia and Rome emperor worship arose, as it survives in Japan even today. The voice of politics becomes the voice of God. Religion has no ethic which maintains itself in spite of politics. The political aims of the group are the law which religion helps to enforce. The representative man of this type of religion is the political leader, and the priest is his servant. The innermost essence of religion is swamped and prostituted by politics. 3) However, a third attitude is possible. Religion may preserve its soul while living in the world, yet cooperating with whatever has an eternal sanction by being critical of all of the culture by which it is surrounded. All deeply ethical religions are of this type. A sublime example is supplied by the ancient Hebrew prophet. Isaiah was perhaps the most completely balanced example. His own religious experience was so profound that he found something which transcended all of the relativities of time and space. Yet he lived in the cultural life of his day, cooperating with whatever conformed to the eternal will of God, yet never losing the moral discrimination which was supplied by his religion. Isaiah was not a recluse, but a prophet who threw the whole weight of his personality into the task of creating a righteous national life. He was a patriot, loving his own people so much that he did not shrink back from employing the surgeon's knife to remove the malignant growths which threatened to undermine her strength. In order to do this he could not be a 100% conformist. Because he had an ethical religion, he had to be critical toward the culture and the national policies of his people. The prophet knew that there is something which is higher than the dictates of political programs and national movements. The will of a government is not the ultimate reality in which man's life is rooted. There is a higher perspective gained by living in and with a power which is holy in a sense in which no human will is holy. When once man has

touched that highest, he cannot give unconditional allegiance to anything that is less than the highest.

Other religions have also made similar discoveries, but I think it is fair to say that the prophetic movement in Israel was the first to achieve such a clear-cut ethical realization of the stand which religion must take to nationalism and culture. Of course not all of the Hebrews were on this high level. The priestly type of religion in Israel very often confused national desires and the divine will. Later Judaism became so nationalistic that it lost the perspective of the prophets from which to judge national life. In spite of the protests of writers like the authors of the books of Jonah and Ruth, national exclusiveness grew until the ethical gains of the prophetic movement had been all but lost.

Other religions have occasionally gained an ethical perspective which also gave them a critical attitude toward human political presumption. Recent scholarship tends to confirm the belief that early Buddhism was not as ascetic as it became in later centuries. For example, King Asoka, the great Indian ruler of the 3rd century B. C., radically revised his nationalistic and military ambitions after becoming a Buddhist. In Buddhism he found a vital over-world which made claims upon him which were stronger than his earlier lust for conquest. And in modern times Japanese Buddhism occasionally shows that it can be critical of the usual assumptions of nationalism. It refuses to regard the political enemy as other than a brother. Imagine a Buddhist general praying over the dead, after conflicts in Korea, "May the Buddhas bestow protection upon each soul who took part *on either side,* and found his last resting place in Korea." There are Buddhists today who, like Christians, are trying to apply a higher standard to national action. In 1924 when the act was pending which excluded the Japanese from America because of racial prejudice, a Buddhist leader sent this message to our president, "Love is supreme. Its voice can never be drowned in the tumult of politics." Younger groups of Buddhists, especially in Japan, are beginning to feel the radical conflict between their religious principles and the policies of governments. When Buddhism abandons its other-worldly asceticism it finds that its ethic brings it face to face with problems akin to those of the Christians.

Has not Christianity repeatedly experienced this tension between a higher ultimate power and a human government? Did not Jesus imply in his teachings that the religious unity of men, as children of one Father, lies far deeper than the parochialisms of geography and nationality? It would be hard to dispute that a great deal of the opposition which he faced was due to his refusal to sanction the nationalistic ambitions of the Jews. And the

early church soon found itself groping for a correct attitude toward the Roman government. Here it stood between the devil and the deep sea. Luke was anxious to dispel the suspicion that Christianity was a foe of government as such. In Acts he repeatedly shows how Paul tried to find justice through the medium of Roman law and the fact of his Roman citizenship. Paul, too, gives the government its due by referring to it as a power ordained of God to preserve order and to punish evil-doers. The early missionaries were anxious to avoid undermining the legitimate functions of the state. Yet the inherent loyalty of the Christian to his God made a clash with the pretentions of the state unavoidable. When the persecutions began, Christianity realized that the question of religion and government was not simple. Is that government ordained of God which gives God second place in life? The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews points out in Ch. XIII that the Christian is one who has a heavenly citizenship, that is, one that transcends man-made obligations. All through the book the writer is steeling his friends for a difficult ordeal. All things are subject to Christ. We must resist to the end any lessening of that claim of Christ. Christianity was facing the great question of whether Christ or the emperor was to be the ultimate ruler of men's lives. A similar situation is in the background of I Peter. Who is he that will harm you? Sanctify in your hearts *Christ* as Lord. The writer goes as far as he can in acknowledging the claims of governments, but there is a point at which the Christian is ready to undergo "fiery trials." Modern scholarship has also done much to unearth the conditions under which the Book of Revelation was written. What a courageous religious tract this is, when put into its proper setting of religious persecution! The seemingly bizarre images of the book are a concealed way of depicting the struggle for lordship between Christ and the kingdom of this world. The great promise is to him that overcometh. The kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ: and he shall reign for ever and ever. He alone is the king of kings and the Lord of Lords. Early Christianity was nursed on the blood of those who dared to assert that there is one will above the will of kings and empires.

If Constantine had not taken the church under the paternalistic wings of the empire this sense of the difference between the will of God and the will of this world would have remained more keen. As the empire then crumbled its place was taken by a growing Papacy. But the problem remained essentially the same. Luther rebelled against the religious imperialism of the Papacy. So far as Luther went, he was true to the genius of early Christianity. It was the old battle for the lordship of God over the

hearts of individual men, clearing away the dead hand of institutionalism and the magical doctrine of salvation by works. The Reformation marks the rebirth of an ethical Christianity. Yet Luther shrank back from applying the ethical insight which he had gained for the individual to the world at large. He applied a divine criticism to the individual heart in its own private sphere, but did not complete the task of the Reformation by applying the same criticism to man's more ramified social life. Much of the ethical authority which he wrested from the Papacy was thus left in the hands of the princes.

Let us not blame Luther for not going beyond the place where he stopped, but let us rather blame ourselves if we do not complete the ethical emancipation which he began. We have been set free from some of the things which he combatted. Now that our hands have been freed thus far, are we willing to grapple with other tyrannies over the soul of man? In our own generation we see that it is possible for the state to do evil and even to be evil. The church, whenever it mentions the Reformation, concedes that the church itself has done evil and bas heen evil. Can we be true to the critical perspective which the Christian ethic gives us if we fail to apply the same rigorous self-criticism to the nations to which we belong? We Americans have had our Macintosh case. We have seen a peerless Christian teacher excluded from the fellowship of our nation because he dared to reserve the right to question whether the vote of Congress always represents the will of God.

However, let us not make the blunder which is so wide-spread in certain circles, the blunder of asserting that all nationalism is and always will be evil. There are certain features of nationalism and patriotism which are not evil in themselves. Is the farmer wrong in loving the soil upon which he has been born and to which he has given his toil? Is the citizen wrong in loving the land of his birth, the natural scene of his labor and dreams? I am sure that Jesus loved the House of Israel. He wept over Jerusalem, a city that was something else for him than Athens or Alexandria or Rome could ever have been. There is something natural, one is almost tempted to say God-given about such emotions. Or are they intrinsically evil? Lest our modern misgivings toward nationalism be utterly unnatural and beside the mark, we should as Christians, occupy ourselves more with the question, "If such a thing is possible, what would a Christian nationalism and patriotism be like?" It seems to me that most of the positive features of patriotism are compatible with Christianity. To see in one's birth-place a gift of God, to appreciate one's mother-tongue, to cherish the memory of great men and women who have ennobled our life, to wish for a unity of purpose in national endeavors, cer-

tainly there is no God-given law against such things. Is it not fantastic to expect to stamp out such sentiments? Yet the Christian conscience cannot admit that such factors completely exhaust the content of what we meet today as nationalism and patriotism. There are certain negative and base characteristics which have become a part of nationalism which are an impudent defiance of the spirit of Christianity. When "national self-respect" asks us to despise other peoples, nationalism has become a parochialism which is a denial of essential Christianity. When nationalism becomes a concealed form of collective egotism, the Christian conscience is violated. Can we approve of a nation slapping itself on the back any more than we would encourage some blatant individual to do the same thing? If some particular type of national culture is exalted as bearing the stamp of divine approval, can the Christian help recalling the Pharisee who thanked God that he was not as other men?

Nationalism and patriotism have always been plagued with certain limitations which the religious man cannot escape. Christianity and all of the higher ethical religions have the effect of sharpening man's imagination in regard to the worth and potentialities of his fellow-man. But most patriotism limits man's imagination so that he sees as virtues those things which are akin to his own characteristics. It is an entity with two characters, a Dr. Jekyll and a Mr. Hyde in one, and lacking the ability to understand its own condition. And it is in special danger of remaining blind because it usually resents the application of any ethical standard. It wants to be a law unto itself.

Much misunderstanding and confusion has arisen in the minds of men today because they do not see this dual character of patriotism. Reinhold Niebuhr has given us a keen analysis of this ethical paradox of patriotism. It is a fusion of altruism and selfishness. "The paradox is that patriotism transmutes individual unselfishness into national egoism. Loyalty to the nation is a high form of altruism when compared with lesser loyalties and more parochial interests. It therefore becomes the vehicle of all the altruistic impulses and expresses itself, on occasion, with such fervor that the critical attitude of the individual toward the nation and its enterprises is almost completely destroyed. . . . Altruistic passion is sluiced into the reservoirs of nationalism with great ease, and is made to flow beyond them with great difficulty. What lies beyond the nation, the community of mankind, is too vague to inspire devotion." And what a queer jumble of "logic" patriotism often employs. A man may sing "I love thy rocks and rills, thy woods and templed hills," and then conclude that because he loves these blessings of nature

that therefore the dictates of the state are noble and deserving of his moral sanction!

Some Christians have tried to dodge the task of understanding the ethical character of nations by simply saying, "The state is not bound by the ethical standards which apply to Christians." To me that seems like moral atheism. It is equivalent to saying that there are spheres of life where there is no God. What they might more properly assert is that they have not yet been able to make an ethical analysis of national conduct. Blinded by the element of altruism and self-sacrifice in patriotic individuals, they have not discerned the collective egotism which nationalism so often expresses. While admiring the sincerity of individual patriots they do not see the hypocrisy which so often unconsciously characterizes the behaviour of states. As individuals we all practice self-deception. Yet how much more difficult is it to discover it when practiced by a large group!

It is the hypocrisy of nations which often leads them to turn so fiercely upon a group of "outsiders" in the midst. Shortly after the World War the Ku Klux Klan spread the doctrine in America that all of the bad features of American life were caused by the Jews, the negroes, the foreigners and the Catholics. The subtle hypocritical assumption was that if America contained only "Americans" then our country would be sinless. The same attitude persists in the continual attempt to attribute all of the crime in America to foreigners. And the savage treatment of the Jews in Germany springs from the same motives to a large degree. Post-war Germany discovered that it had been deceived, profiteered upon, and flooded by lewd literature and disruptive theories. The assumption is then made that this cannot possibly have been done by the Germans themselves, consequently it was done entirely by the Jews. If the true patriots had been in control, the national life would be stainless! The irony of it all is that some Jews of old used to assume that all of the corruption of the sons of Abraham came via the Gentiles. The more one studies the arguments of the Nazis the more one is struck by the similarity of their motives to the chauvinism of Ezra and Nehemiah, the precursors of later Phariseeism. The spirit of the last chapters of Ezra and Nehemiah might well be incorporated in a Nazi manifesto.

It is not easy to criticize a tortured nation when one has lived there and learned to see how international cruelty has made them beside themselves. Yet we cannot praise the abnormal simply because it has its causes. And should we not expect a higher insight coming from the Church of Christ! Antisemitism was bitter in Germany a decade ago, so bitter that I could not understand why the church did not at least do something to save its own soul. Yet

I never heard a word of reconciliation. Just in the past month a prominent German missionary magazine published an article by a Missionsinspektor in which all of the old epithets of "Christ-killers and the race "cursed of God" were heaped upon the Jews. How much we ought to learn from that drama across the Atlantic concerning the dangers of allowing a fiery nationalism to dull the rigorous self-criticism which Christians ought to apply to their own national life! However much the reports may be distorted which we receive in America, certain things are indisputable. A large number of the finest churchmen and theologians have been dismissed for daring to refuse to surrender their minds and consciences to a political movement. The state denies that it has violated the liberty of the church, yet no man can retain a position of leadership in the church if he does not lend his influence to the program of the Nazis. In what respect is the doctrine of a "totalitarian state" with its appropriation of the dynamic of the religious feelings for the purpose of achieving political conformity, superior to the old Roman assumption of the state as the object of man's highest allegiance? Certain German theologians have severely criticized English-speaking churches for their interest in the application of a Christian ethic to the social relationships, claiming that this means the mixing of religion and politics. German Lutheran theology has on the whole kept away from such an attempt. As a result they have not been trained to analyze the social forces which surround them, or to discriminate between the demands of Christianity and the political dreams of people who more or less belong to the churches. Many ministers may believe that a certain political leader is accomplishing great things for Germany, but does this justify them in stating that he is the anointed of the Lord, thus giving the political movement an absolute character? (This impression is gained, not from American newspaper reports, but from reading German sources.) What will happen when men wager their religion on a political movement, when they use God to push along a popular wave of opinion? A theology which was once so fearful of examining political life is now helpless in the face of it.

But we Americans should not be Pharisees in this matter. An understanding of our life leads us to pray, "God be merciful unto *me* a sinner." We are truly fortunate in that our national life is so blessed with freedom from international pressure that we, of all nations, ought to be able to think through the issue of nationalism and religion in an unhampered way. We shall be all the more to blame if the American Church does not struggle upward to a Christian viewpoint in this matter. What are we doing when the official viewpoint of our nation, as expressed in the Macintosh case, is that there is no law but the state, and Congress is its prophet. Chris-

tianity teaches us that no man is a law unto himself. We see the daily need of subjecting ourselves to self-criticism in the light of a higher will. Our will is not a perfect will. And the state, which is a product of the human will, is subject to the same frailties which beset our individual lives. If we were to assert that the collective will of men, incorporated in the state, is beyond the criticism of conscience, we might just as well assert that all of us who compose the state are infallible saints. Before God we cannot!

THE PULPIT OF YESTERDAY AND TODAY

By F. W. Schroeder

Preaching has always been regarded as one of the major functions of the Christian church. Both the style and the content have undergone changes in succeeding generations. Theological views have always colored the message. Sermons preached by men of the Lutheran persuasion are for the most part introvert, exploring the recesses of the inner life, whereas sermons with a Calvinistic background are more public-minded, placing greater emphasis upon the problems of civilization. But while there are many differences, men of every persuasion and of every age would no doubt subscribe to the definition that a sermon is "a discourse delivered in public for the purpose of religious instruction and grounded on some text or passage of Scripture." Most men will agree, too, with Henry Sloan Coffin that a sermon should "arouse thought, kindle imagination, touch feeling, enlist conscience, and commit the whole man to Him who gives himself unreservedly to us." And while none of the New Testament writers ever attempted to state the purpose of preaching it is not amiss to regard Paul's statement, "teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ" as an adequate norm and guide of all preaching.

In comparing the pulpit of yesterday with that of today it is not our purpose to pit one against the other and possibly claim superiority for the one or the other. Such a comparison would in all probability reveal the prejudices of the writer and perhaps lack that objectivity of outlook which is so essential to any just and fair appraisal. The purpose of this study is simply to record a few observations and impressions in the hope that these might prove to be suggestive and create anew an appreciation of and an interest in the great and difficult task of preaching. Our comparison will confine itself to three lines of investigation: The use of the text, the content of the sermon, and the preacher's general objective.

The Use of the Text

In the relationship of the text to the sermon we come upon one of the most pronounced differences between the pulpit of yesterday and today. The fathers adhered to the principle that the entire content of the sermon must be contained in the text. They explored the chosen passage of Scripture for all its worth, and brought forth many treasures new and old. But in spite of this acknowledged ideal they sometimes brought forth also such treasures which obviously were not contained in the text. Man's particular interests will ever lead him into the temptation of reading into the text a truth that is especially congenial to his mind but which at best is only very distantly related to the central truth of that text.

The modern pulpit makes no pretense at preaching what might be called a textual sermon. The topic is the all-important consideration. It is still the custom to preface the sermon with a word of Holy Writ, but quite obviously some treat it purely as a custom. Only too often the text is merely a convenient starting point, employed, so it seems, to lend a kind of ecclesiastical sanction to the theme the preacher is about to develop. Any one reading the Christian Century Pulpit, which undoubtedly offers a fair cross-section of contemporaneous preaching, will find ample evidence to confirm this assertion. A study of fifty of its most recent sermons showed the following result: Thirty-one could be regarded as textual, whereas seventeen merely employed a text to have a Biblical starting point and two had no text at all. The orthodox theologians of old would have disqualified such sermons without further ceremony; but it does not necessarily follow from the absence or disregard of the text, that the sermon is therefore void of a spiritual message. And yet the omission or neglect of the text is ominous.

Contemporary preaching is frankly topical rather than textual. This procedure is not without some justification. It is better to have folk go home with one idea well established than to have them leave with a jumble of several unrelated thoughts. The fathers sometime sacrificed unity for the sake of covering the whole text; today men often sacrifice the content of the text to the development of their theme. Because a sermon should have unity of thought the text need not be sacrificed. Surely, even the most ardent advocate of the topical method must recognize the validity of Dr. Coffin's position when he says, "however a sermon arises in a man's mind—and many do not originate in texts—it is always the richer and more surely Christian for being well grounded in a passage of Scripture."

Moreover, modern preaching, because it is so liberal in its use or disregard of the text, stands in danger of too much subjective preaching. Unless a preacher searches the Scriptures diligently and derives his message and his inspiration from this source he is apt to confine himself to those topics that are of special interest to him instead of exploring the larger social heritage of the Christian community. It is difficult to escape the impression, that some of the great central truths of religion are neglected simply because texts are not used as faithfully and extensively as in the days of yore. The faithful use of texts assures greater variety and makes for more comprehensive preaching. Some sermon themes will be suggested by the preacher's reading and his observations in the congregation, but he who searches the Scriptures for its treasures will come upon great and inspiring themes that would never have occurred to him if left to his own devices.

The Content of the Sermon

When reading the sermons of the previous generation one soon becomes aware of what one might call a distinctly religious note. The language is not the language of the street. The ideas are not the ones that are discussed on the public square. High and holy things, invisible and heavenly realities constitute the subject of their message. The whole sermon seems to move in another world. The fathers did not say much about the ordinary, common, everyday affairs of life; they spoke of the will and the law of God, and of the love and the grace of Jesus Christ. Sin, repentance, regeneration, sanctification, faith, hope, love—these and similar terms which have a distinctly religious connotation abound in the sermons of yesterday. The master pulpiteers used this distinctly religious tone to great advantage, but those of lesser ability often mistook the use of religious phrases for a truly religious message and substituted pious platitudes for real spiritual nurture. Sometimes the preacher of eternal truths became a mere ecclesiastical pedant paraphrasing Biblical phrases or a religious historian reconstructing the experiences of the past in minute detail. The result was that religion became a sort of record of past experiences void of any real bearing upon the life of that day.

The pulpit of today strikes a more secular note. Very few of the modern sermons can be said to be laden with any excess baggage of religious phraseology. However, it would be a mistake to conclude, that the sermons of today are less religious in spirit because they are more secular in tone. The mere use of religious phrases does not make a sermon a profitable religious discourse. What the modern sermon lacks in the way of a religious tone is more than compensated by its realism in coming to grips with the everyday experiences of the average man. The pulpit of today gets down to the level where men live; it speaks the language men understand; it discusses the problems in which men are vitally interested. And as a result there is less habitual sleeping in the pew. In the days of yore many a deacon or elder, who attended services regularly, went to sleep during the sermon with the confidence that his pastor would not say anything that he had not heard before. Whatever weaknesses the pulpit of today may have, it cannot be accused of being dull. The pulpiteers of today have learned the art of arousing and holding the interest of the listener.

As already indicated, that is due in a large measure to the fact that the sermons of today come to grips with the contemporary problems of the individual and the civilization in which he moves. In this respect the sermons of yesterday are characterized by what one might almost term an aloofness from life. The fathers subordinated the temporal to the eternal. Reading their sermons one is

impressed that they were dealing with the problems of eternity rather than the issues of contemporary civilization. The sermons of a Robertson of Brighton, of Spurgeon, of Brooks and Beecher, and especially of the great German preachers make you aware that they were proclaiming a message sufficiently detached from the contemporary situation to make their sermons equally fitting in almost any generation. This sense of detachment is not to be understood in the sense that they ignored the problems and perplexities of their flock—for that would not be true; but one has the feeling that while these men lived in the world they were not of the world. Save for a few minor changes in style and phraseology many of these sermons could be preached with equal appropriateness today. This feature, that might be termed the eternal fitness of their sermons, rates as one of the greatest achievements of the fathers.

By way of contrast the modern sermon is distinctly contemporaneous. The fifty sermons of the Christian Century Pulpit previously referred to, were also examined to determine the nature of their content. Ten of the fifty sermons were seasonal in the sense that they were Thanksgiving, Christmas or Easter sermons. Of the remaining forty, twenty were such that they might have been preached in 1900 as well as in 1933. However, the other twenty were so distinctly and exclusively related to the present situation—the economic crisis and the social problems peculiar to our day—that they would be out of date within less than a decade. To conclude from this that forty or fifty percent of the sermons of today are of this type would be erroneous, but it does indicate the modern trend. Opinions will differ as to the merits of such preaching. It has this commendable feature, that the Christians of today will never be able to excuse their selfishness, their avarice, their ruthless individualism or any other social sin by saying that the church never brought this phase of the gospel to their attention. On the other hand there is danger that the pulpit might neglect the basic beliefs of Christianity so completely as to encourage the idea, that religion is just a matter of maintaining right relations with men. It is very good to insist, that religion is an affair of man's everyday life and conduct, but if men should lose sight of the fact that religion also has to do with ultimate spiritual values which transcend the boundaries of time and space, the net result might be a shallow moral philosophy lacking the enthusiasm which only a great religion can inspire.

The Preacher's Objective

An interesting comparison can also be made in regard to the purpose of the sermon. As a general rule the preacher, who has not become a mere professional, has a specific purpose for each

sermon. Certain immediate results that he hopes to accomplish give his message the note of urgency which is typical of all great preaching. But aside from this specific purpose of each sermon, a more general purpose is revealed in the preaching of a given man, a given generation, or a given theological school. According to the preacher's particular outlook this general purpose, of which he is not necessarily conscious, will color his message. It is of this general purpose that we wish to speak.

If the content of the sermons of the past furnishes any clue, the fathers seem to have deemed it a part of their mission to impart knowledge of Biblical facts. Their sermons abound with quotations from the Old and New Testaments and with illustrations of Biblical incidents. The congregations of a former generation were well versed in Biblical lore. Very few of today would concede that to be a virtue in itself. And it would be unfair to the fathers to say that they thought so. While it might seem to us that some of them did little more than to indoctrinate men with the Bible and to interpret the Bible, it would be more correct to say that they sought to interpret life by the Bible. The varied experiences of the Hebrew race and the lives of its great phophets and leaders were used advantageously to cover the whole range of human experience. In view of the fact that men and women frequently saw the implication of these historical incidents, even though the application to contemporary life was not always made, one can easily excuse what to us appears as an over-emphasis upon the importance of Biblical knowledge as such.

The pulpit of today also aims to impart knowledge; but the subject material is not taken from the Bible. In place of the Biblical lore of old the sermons of today abound with statistics and data concerning all the problems and movements of the modern day. Contemporary preaching indicates that the ministry of today is well-read. Our pulpiteers are aware of what is transpiring in the world. And certainly the modern pulpit does make a valuable contribution to the spiritual life of mankind by the wise and discreet use of such facts. Save for a well-informed ministry many Christians of today would be blissfully ignorant of the evils and iniquities in which they knowingly and involuntarily share. But there is also danger that the pulpit might furnish information and little more. Information without inspiration is of little avail. Unless the pulpit also supplies the necessary motivation to act, little will come of the knowledge that men have about the problems of their world. That inspiration and motivation to act, today as of old, must come from Him who sealed His ideals with His blood on Calvary.

There is yet another difference in regard to purpose. The fathers preached with the aim of saving immortal souls. The redemption of the individual was the burden of their message. To save as many as possible from eternal condemnation was the object of their preaching. And so their sermons, to a very large extent, were built around such themes as sin and salvation, repentance and regeneration, sanctification and justification. Such preaching was not without visible results. Men knew themselves to be sinners. Many were called to repentance. And yet the results were not all salutary. Many of the saved drew their garments about them in feigned righteousness lest they become contaminated by the sins of the world. Many of those who took religion seriously became so concerned about their own soul's salvation that they did nothing to redeem the world. Men were not challenged to create a Christian world in which it would be easier for succeeding generations to live according to the Christian ideal.

The pulpit of today is thinking almost exclusively in terms of a Christian world. The Kingdom of Heaven—which is one of our most favorite expressions—is conceived of to be a mundane rather than a supermundane state. Save for the sermons of the old-time evangelists and perhaps some extreme fundamentalists, the modern pulpit reveals few utterances that aim at saving souls for eternity. The preachers of today deem it to be their mission to Christianize the social order, it being inferred that salvation in the world to come will follow quite naturally if men will zealously and intelligently apply themselves to the immediate task of redeeming the world. Naturally a modern writer is partial to that view, and yet an objective view of the matter will lead one to say, that there is danger that the pulpit shall become so absorbed in saving civilization that it will cease to be the mouthpiece of an eternal God who would speak through the pulpit to the souls of men. The possibility is not remote—as humanism will indicate—that the pulpit can become so adept in discussing moral problems that it will cease to be genuinely religious.

In closing we might make a brief summary of some characteristic differences. The fathers were men of one Book and dedicated their talents to the noble art of expounding its truths, but sometimes they limited themselves so exclusively to its use as to shun all other material which might have given their sermons more variety and color. The pulpiteers of today are men of many books and enrich the content of their sermons by quoting the great writers of all ages, but sometimes this endeavor to discover the great treasures of literature leads them to overlook the treasures of the one Book which was written by men moved by the Spirit of God. In the days of old the noble resolve to know nothing "save Jesus

Christ and Him crucified" caused preachers at times to weary their congregations by the constant repetition of the same ideas; today the laudable motive to be intellectually stimulating at times causes men to parade their learning—not to say sophistication—so that their congregations must wonder whether they are in the sanctuary or the lecture hall. In the days of yore men were frequently challenged to accept Jesus Christ, but they were not always adequately informed just what was involved in such an acceptance; today men are constantly challenged to Christianize the social order, but the pulpit often neglects to supply the need motivation, such as Paul had when he explained his zeal by saying, "the love of Christ constraineth us." If one were to score the sermons of yesterday and today one would no doubt discover that the failures and the achievements of both are about equally divided. However, the pulpit of today might profitably take cognizance of the sermons of yesterday, and add to its own fine qualities the best the fathers can teach us.

THE MINISTER AS SCHOLAR

Alvin J. Munsterman

Many young men leave the Seminary with the high resolve to do a great deal of studying upon certain phases of the many subjects that were presented to them in the varied courses at the Seminary. They hope to become immersed in a definite field of study, so that they may become experts in that particular realm or thought. But alas for the experiences of the first few years in the ministry! The minister becomes engulfed in myriad claims upon his time, leadership and strength, so that in due time the challenging subjects are permanently laid aside and perhaps even forgotten. The ministry is so varied, and so much is expected of the modern minister that avenues into the pastor's life become very numerous, with the result that a minister begins to lead a cluttered life. The preacher will have the sad experience of intellectual poverty instead of growth, and awaken to the fact that he is moving in parochial circles.

The Scholar Minister and the Present Age

The world is in a desperate moral and spiritual state. The preacher is not alone in diagnosing the present day situation. Every field of contemporary thought and activity is concerned about some phase of the current situation. It is comparatively easy to shout from our pulpits as a little Mount Sinai, but an exceedingly difficult task to follow the injunction of the Master's ordination: "Feed my sheep." The people in our pews are tired and worn by pulpit diagnoses, without offering some tangible solution for their perplexing problems and baffling experiences. The wise physician, after years of careful study, research, observation and experience, is not only able to diagnose a particular malady, but also to prescribe a remedy, and definite steps for a full or partial recovery. So the preacher must know the conditions and symptoms of the age, and after study, research, observation and experience, he is in a position to suggest the Way of Jesus as the way of men. It sounds simple, but to stand before the same congregation every Sunday, year after year, the task of preaching overwhelms the minister at times, that is, if he takes his preaching seriously. The day of the Pollyanna gospel is past.

Some ministers and their families have undergone untold suffering and anxiety during the past few years. Coupled with this sad fact, to bring to the congregation a helpful and encouraging message the modern minister needs to study and spend more hours in careful preparation than ever before. If the preachers of the past were scholars, the ministry today needs to lose itself in dili-

gent study and find itself again in preaching with power and conviction the great realities of life.

A Scholarly Study of the Bible

Religion touches every realm of thought and activity of life; hence many fields of special study beckon the minister for further thought. The minister should be a scholar when it comes to the Bible, above all the other books upon his desk. If the minister finds difficulty among his people in their understanding of the Old Testament, it ought to be a challenge to him to master its message, the great areas of experience, the prophetic utterances, and permanent abiding values of the interesting section known as the Old Testament. We have not outgrown the Old Testament. To begin, read the Bible or the designated part for special attention before you read the books about the Bible. Learn to handle the primary sources before using the secondary sources. The current series of articles in the Evangelical Herald on the Books of the Bible ought to provide a good beginning as an aid to study. Some ministers feel that they need exceedingly large personal libraries or other libraries at their command to be scholars of the Bible. After a thorough study of a particular book, character, purpose and teaching, read everything you have in your own library on this subject. Have a pencil and paper and make copious notes on the subjects studied. Add your own thoughts and reactions.

An unknown and practically forgotten field is the Intertestamental period, with the many writings known as the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. A year of scholarly research in this department will give the minister a new and wonderful introduction to the portals of the New Testament, and a new appreciation of the genius of Jesus and His message.

Some will find it easier to begin with the New Testament, especially with the Life of Jesus and the message of the Gospels. A thorough study of the teachings of Jesus will be rewarding. Take every subject on which Jesus spoke—God, man, sin, the kingdom, forgiveness, true righteousness, eternal life, etc.—and bring the teachings together under each one of these headings. Comb your books on Biblical Interpretation, Commentaries, and Theology for everything pertaining to these subjects, making notes of the important sentences or outlines of the interpretations. Never neglect to add your own reactions, thoughts or comments. Almost every minister has scores of sermonic books upon his shelves, many of which have not been opened for years. Make a fresh study of them, noting carefully all references to the teachings of Jesus, and after stating the volume and page, give in a few sentences their application to the particular teaching or experience to present day life.

This plan can be carried even further. The modern minister needs equilibrium, and the poets are at our command. All references or allusions to the text or teachings should be noted. Spend a few hours in going over the back numbers of theological, religious, missionary and cultural magazines and you will find related topics for more notes. Experiences of the minister or others in the books of biography will come to mind. In short, by the end of six months, the minister, by reviewing his findings from time to time, will have a new book of which he is the author and master. Sermon topics, texts, series of sermons, will suggest themselves during the course of scholarly study, and the reward will be an untold enrichment in preaching. The minister will not live in fear and trembling intellectually and spiritually from Sunday to Sunday. The rest of the New Testament can then be studied and certainly some definite plans of comprehensive work will evolve after a thorough study and analysis of the writings.

A foretaste of this method which will add zest to the high office of preaching is to plan or "block out" the sermons in advance. Select a number of texts or subjects for a series of sermons for a definite number of Sundays. Write the text or subject, with the date at the top. Keep them handy and jot down all references and thoughts as you find them. Keep adding page after page of notes, and when the material is placed before you for sermonic construction, there will be a wealth of material that cannot be gathered in one morning or in two days. Planned preaching as planned study, keeps the minister from following pet hobbies or favorite themes. A scholarly study of the Bible gives the preacher the priceless possession of the power of release, conviction and growth in preaching. The Barthian indictment of modern preaching has much truth in it, that the modern preacher bends the text instead of bending before the text.

Following the mastery of the Bible, the minister may take up one of many fascinating subjects which are related to his work. The great problems of theology and philosophy call for intellectual acumen. It is not so important as to how many books one has read in this field, as the mastery of some of the important and standard works that is essential. There is a renewed interest in biography of all kinds which is always helpful to the preacher in his interpretation of life. A list of other fields of study is herewith briefly though incompletely given, not stated according to their importance however: History, with its many social and religious movements; Devotional Literature; Christian and Character Education; Worship; Homiletics; Living World Religions; Home and Foreign Missions; Science; Adult Education; Barthianism; Buchmanism; Psychology; Psychiatry; World Peace; Stewardship; Christian

Unity; Church and Industry; Church and Rural Life; Church and the Economic Order; Nationalism; The Jewish-Christian Relationships, Christian Archaeology; Customs and Folklore; Parish Programs and Publicity; Religious Cults and Practices; Confirmation Instruction; Church and Recreation; The Church Year, History, Customs and Usage; Hymnology and Sacred Music; Social Work and Religion; Religious Drama and Poetry; Essays and Letters: Life as Interpreted in Great Fiction.

The danger is to read and study here and there, and not comprehensively. It is not the number of books one has read, but the number of good books mastered through the crucible of our own mind and experience. The saying, "Big thoughts make big men," is true of preachers today as in generations ago. An example of modern preaching of the minister as scholar may be found in the preacher whose training and heritage is Scotland. His preaching has breadth, height and depth, motivated by a fine devotion to the Master and a passion for the kingdom. One hears and sees a fine scholarly mastery of subject, however, never bringing the utensils of scholarly research into the pulpit, but catching the deep abiding spiritual experience and message of the text. For helpful suggestions on any particular phase of scholarly interest the reader might write to the editor of this magazine or to any member of the faculty of Eden Seminary.

Definite Hours for Study

In many lectures on preaching we are admonished to set aside five mornings a week for study. It sounds wonderful and seems easy, but the distractions of the modern minister are many and the inroads made upon his morning hours of study are untold in number and manner. Every minister should formulate a definite schedule of the use of his morning hours. If he can cloister himself for four hours, that minister should count himself fortunate. Four uninterrupted hours without a plan, challenging subject and determination to see it through, can be wasted in day dreaming or dabbling around in the study. Frankly, no profession has place or time for the dabbler; certainly not the ministry. The longer the pastorate, the more difficult is it to have stated hours of study, because the minister's parish interests and cares are many. The minister must always remember that his first duty is to the larger group, meaning the church as a whole. To serve them effectively as a preacher, certain hours of study are necessary. Some men cannot give four hours of study to any subject at one time. They become mentally tired after two hours. One minister discussed the entire matter with the Church Council, emphasizing the necessity of thorough and careful pulpit preparation for the minister, and

what was expected of the modern preacher, and how necessary it was for him and the congregation that he should have definite hours of study. The result was that a Sunday bulletin suggested that all telephone calls and interviews be made between the hours of 10:30 A. M. and 1 P. M., and between 5 and 7 P. M. in the evening, except in emergency cases or for exceptional messages. Thus the minister used a table in another room of the house, placed his books and notes for special research there, and was able to spend a goodly number of hours in quiet morning study. At 10:30 he would be in his study, ready to answer the telephone, read his mail, despatch and attend to the parish administration. When the church has a secretary, the matter is somewhat easier. Some of the afternoons and evenings not used for meetings or parish calls could be set aside for special study and sermonic preparation. To start this work of special research or thorough study, another room than the regular study is a good place, especially in the beginning. Then the books and papers can be left undisturbed on the table until the next day. Other men find it easier to use the early morning hours for study, and still other groups find the hours between 10 P. M. and 2 A. M. the most creative. The minister needs time to think. He must have a large amount of determination to keep at the problem under research. When a vexing problem arises, he will appreciate these stated times of study and not become a victim of the problem, but rise above it.

The minister as a scholar has the reward of a disciplined and trained mind, and is endowed with a riper knowledge and an added power and personality for the problems and tasks that confront the modern ministry. The minister will have the personal gratification of being a scholar, and possessing a mastery of some field of study. This joy and reward will be shared by his congregation.

IN WHAT DIRECTION SHOULD OUR MISSIONARY STRATEGY BE CHANGED

By Dr. A. Stueler

(Conclusion)

II

Foreign Missions

In view of the fact that Foreign Missions by opponents and friends have often and searchingly been scrutinized as to their motives, value, policy and methods and have continually undergone needed adjustments and changes, there appears to be no occasion for alarm with regard to their efficiency. Our own fields in India and Honduras are no exceptions and, in keeping with the limited means at our disposal, have been improved according to modern trends and standards without being torn loose from their Scriptural moorings and launched out into the dangerous sea of a shallow liberalism and superficial humanism. Fortunately, according to its Statement on the Laymen's Report entitled "Rethinking Missions," our Foreign Mission Board is not willing to be swept off its feet by the devastating criticisms and radical recommendations advanced by the Appraisal Commission of the Laymen's Inquiry, though it holds some of these recommendations to be sound, timely and practicable. Our Board is "gratified to find that some of the measures recommended have been advocated for years by our leaders on the field, and that in some instances steps toward their realization have already been taken." The criticisms of the Report (as for the sake of brevity we shall designate this Laymen'e Appraisal of Missions) with their implied or expressed recommendations are so numerous that it is utterly impossible to discuss them here in detail. It would take a volume instead of a few pages to do so. We shall, therefore, treat them rather summarily and select only a few for special examination, in keeping with our task which consists in determining whether or not any changes should be made in our foreign missionary methods.

When at a ministers' meeting we were first made acquainted with the Report we arose in protest to a considerable part of its contents and were told that Dr. Robert T. Speer had the same objections set forth in a pamphlet: "Rethinking Missions Examined." We have since then read this splendid little book and, as it in the main points describes our own reaction to the Report, we could possibly just recommend its perusal and consider our task accomplished. Indeed, we advise our laymen to either procure for themselves a copy at very little cost or ask their pastor to lend them

the book together with the other literature sent out recently by the Mission Board. However, in pursuit of what we have proposed to do, some observations will have to be made here.

It may be said that the Report has rendered a distinct service by reviving an interest in foreign missions on the part of thousands who had almost forgotten this vital and important obligation of the Church. This Appraisal, in spite of its alarming and highly controversial features, is not a condemnation of missions, but answers the question whether they should go on in the affirmative saying: "It is somewhat like asking whether good-will should continue or cease to express itself." But when it makes the continuation of missionary activities dependent upon a changed theological basis and on unification of all mission boards in one super-agency which is to distribute all mission money and alone direct the missionary policy, we must emphatically disagree.

The proposed theological basis, which the Report treats in 4 long chapters, is the doctrine of modernistic, merely ethical, altruistic-humanistic liberalism which came to us from Europe some decades ago but has long been replaced there again by a profound Biblicism, or evangelicalism, grounded on the clear-cut teachings of the New Testament. This theology concerns itself exclusively with the social side of the Gospel, leaving out its redemptive and regenerating power; it wants to foster the by-products of Christianity, schools, hospitals, clinics, rural and industrial improvement projects, social betterment enterprizes and the like, all detached from direct evangelistic-religious influence and control, as "being in themselves expressions of the Christian Gospel and standing as such," on the one hand ceasing to be means to a supreme end and on the other hand without the essential dynamic of salvation, regeneration and sanctification through Jesus Christ behind them. But you cannot have the fruits without the tree, and should this kind of "missionary work" ever be attempted, the beautiful structure would soon collapse having no solid foundation and not drawing sufficient financial support from an evangelical constituency giving their money in the belief that it is used to bring unfortunate heathen people into contact with Christ, Who, not only as the Great Teacher and Example but as the Divine Savior, Redeemer and Lord, is alone the hope and cure for all the sins and all the ills of the world. For the same reasons the creation of the suggested Interdenominational Super Mission Board—otherwise, that is, if all would agree on an absolutely evangelical basis, a very splendid idea—is ill-advised and practically impossible.

The Report lacks historical background, does not recognize the tremendous progress already made, and is most unfair to the missionary personnel. While the Appraisers have come into contact

with only a very small minority of the missionaries, in each case for a very short time, they have the almost unbelievable audacity to stamp 95% of the men and women who are giving their lives for Christ in these foreign lands as unworthy representatives of the churches, calling them men of "limited outlook and capacity." Is the capacity and outlook of any human being, including the Commissioners, unlimited?! They require that "the best or none" should be sent. This counsel of perfection is discouraging because it simply cannot be carried out. But surely, the best that can be obtained should be selected, as it has been attempted by all the boards in the past. According to the judgment and testimony of competent men and women who have had 40 and 50 years, and not a few days or weeks, of intimate acquaintance with thousands of missionaries and constantly studied their fields and attainments, the fact is, in reversal of the figures, that 95% of them are worthy representatives of the Church of Jesus Christ, while perhaps 5% are unfit for the task committed to them. This latter group, for the most part, comprises rationalists, modernists, agnostics and humanists who have really no Christian message at all.

We agree with the Presbyterian Board that, "apart from its theological basis the following recommendations of the Report are sound and should be carried out: "its discernment of the special importance and beneficent influence of the work done by missionary women; its insistence on the principle of self-support and genuine independence in the indigenous churches; its insistence on the desirability of reality in the transfer of authority to the indigenous agencies in plans of devolution; its emphasis on the preponderance of a vast rural population and the need of effort directed to them; its call for better teaching in all schools; its discernment of the duty of Christian missions toward the great masses of men dissatisfied with their old religions; its insistence on the best quality of service that is possible in every form of work which is done in the Christian name; its constant emphasis on the need of the application of Christianity to human life and relationships; its appeal for a higher type of representatives of American trade, who will sympathize and cooperate with the missionary movement; its call for the largest possible measures of cooperation and unity among all the Christian forces engaged in the work of foreign missions."

The Report criticizes missions as having been too self-sufficient, antagonistic to non-Christian religions and not cooperative and sharing enough with them. It wants Christianity to recognize the good and worthwhile in the ethnic faiths, share it with them and work together with them in a common quest for truth. Certainly, the missionary should not directly antagonize the adherents of any religion; he is to come to them, not as their foe, but as their friend.

But when the Report recommends co-existence of Christianity and the pagan religions, with practically equal value accorded them, condoning the various forms of heathen worship, immorality and oppression, that means recognition of idolatry as justified, is a grievous transgression of the first commandment, upon which all the others rest as a foundation, and must under no circumstances be tolerated. If there is any good in any religion we should honestly acknowledge it; but Christianity cannot afford to compromise with these religions, much less abase itself to seeking the final truth in company with them. It need not seek it for it has Christ, and Christ is The Truth as He is The Way and The Life. This happy fact, along with gratitude, obedience and love, is Christianity's justification and motive in compassionately trying to impart to others this knowledge, sharing it with them and urging their acceptance of this most precious possession. There is, however, an element of real wisdom in this recommendation of the Report. Knowing—as the Appraisers evidently do not—that there is nothing of spiritual value which is abiding that may not also be found in Christianity, the missionary should, in a greater measure than has been done so far, use all the good in the ethnic religions and build thereon. The example of the Apostle Paul in Athens is cited, passing over, however, the sequel as Dr. Speer remarks. It is generally assumed, and even Dr. Speer apparently thinks so, that this sequel spelled failure. Contrary to this unwarranted opinion we learn from Acts 17: 32-34 that Paul, in spite of his very brief stay in Athens, met with pronounced success there. Not only was he immediately after his sermon on Mars' Hill asked to preach again, which because of his sudden unexplained departure for Corinth he was prevented from doing, but verse 34 shows unmistakably that his one sermon resulted in a number of converts. Two of these are mentioned by name: Dionysius, the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris. Whenever the exceedingly brief accounts of the New Testament give us the name of any person there is a special significance attached to it, and we may take it for granted that the vast influence of these people of the highest political and social position was worth many times more for the spread of the Gospel than the immediate organization of a small church consisting of a score or two of comparatively non-influential members. Using the known good in any religion as an approach and starting point is a method in missionary preaching holding great promises. Paul used this method not only in Athens but also among the Jews.

Though our space and time is up, we must yet quote an illuminating passage contained in a letter from Rev. F. A. Goetsch, Associate Foreign Mission Secretary. He says: "Our strategy as a Board at this present time must be directed, if not primarily at

least very earnestly, toward the home constituency. I think it can be said that foreign missions has been a minority cause in all church bodies. Those who love the missionary cause are usually its consecrated supporters while there is a large group of adherents to the Christian Church which participates only half-heartedly or not at all. The strategy of the Board must be to bring to the consciousness of the home church the urgency of the Master's missionary commission and seek to rally each member of the church to an active participation in the cause of missions."

In conclusion, let us more than heretofore remember that the best way to promote missions is the individual and collective Christian life of holiness, righteousness and love in unreserved conformity to the revealed will of God. Let us also constantly be reminded of the efficacy and power of prayer, not omitting to make daily intercession before the Throne of Grace with the fervent and believing petition: "Thy Kingdom Come!"

Die Betätigung des christlichen Charakters in der staatlichen Gemeinschaft.

Von Prof. Dr. Grützmacher.

II.

Staat, Obrigkeit, Revolution, Politik, Krieg.

Bildet das Recht das charakteristische Merkmal des Staates, so gehören zu dessen Wesen und Betätigungen noch andre wichtige Elemente. Der Staat existiert in Wirklichkeit nicht in der Einzahl, sondern in der Vielzahl konkreter Gebilde. Er umfaßt verschiedene Völker oder Nationen. Diese sind nicht identisch mit Rassen. **Rasse** gründet sich wesentlich auf physiologische Merkmale, die dann auch ins Seelisch-Geistige hineinreichen. Sie existieren in der Gegenwart wirklich nur in den ganz großen Gebilden, der Weißen, Schwarzen, Gelben Rasse, während alle Untergebilde einschließlich der germanischen im Lauf der Geschichte Mischungen eingegangen sind. So bemerkt ein Sachkundiger — Boas — über Europa: „In Europa ist seit langer Zeit kaum irgendwo eine reine Rasse vorhanden gewesen, und es hat sich nirgends herausgestellt, daß andauernde Mischung an sich zu einer Schädigung geführt hat. Man könnte genau so gut behaupten und mit ebensoguten Gründen beweisen, daß die Völker, die keine Störungen in ihrer Blutsmischung von außenher erlitten haben, deshalb einer allmählichen Erschlaffung verfallen sind." **Vom Standpunkt des Christentums sind alle Rassen gleichwertig, weil alle fähig das Evangelium zu empfangen.** Das paulinische Wort: „Hier ist nicht Jude, noch Grieche, sondern allezumal Einer in Christo," gestattet und verlangt auch seine Ausdehnung auf die Rassen. Auch ihre Vermischung im Lauf der Geschichte ist nicht ohne Gotteswillen erfolgt. Die Verbindung eines Einzelnen mit einer Persönlichkeit einer wirklich verschiedenen Rasse wird allerdings die ernsteste Prüfung verlangen, ob die nötigen seelischen und geistigen Voraussetzungen für eine vollkommene Lebensgemeinschaft gegeben sind und nicht nur rein äußere Reize gewirkt haben. Von diesem Standort aus ergibt sich auch die Stellung des Christentums zu der immer wieder auftauchenden und in der Gegenwart wieder sehr lebendigen **Judenfrage.** Die Juden sind ein Bestandteil der weißen Rasse; innerhalb dieser haben sie sich allerdings — trotz auch hier besonders in alter Zeit nicht fehlender Mischungen — eine sehr starke völkische Blutsreinheit und damit entsprechende Charaktereigenschaften bewahrt. Das hat für sie selbst, wie für die andern Völker, eine instinktive Distanz hervorgerufen, die mit der Verbundenheit, in der sie tatsächlich innerhalb andrer Nationen leben, in Spannung tritt. Die einfachste, aber doch nur von einem Teil der Juden selbst gewünschte und im Zionismus prak-

tisch in Angriff genommene Lösung wäre die auch räumliche Zusammenfassung des Judentums in Palästina. So lange und soweit das nicht der Fall ist, **wird die Bekämpfung der Juden rein auf Grund ihres völkischen Wesens vom Christentum nicht gebilligt werden können. Noch weniger kann dieses die jüdische Religion bekämpfen, die geschichtlich und sachlich die Vorstufe des Christentums bildet.** Denn alle Versuche, das Christentum vom Judentum religionsgeschichtlich zu lösen oder Jesus zu einem Arier zu machen, sind leere Phantasien. Auf der andern Seite **hat das Judentum im Lauf seiner Geschichte eine Reihe sehr unerfreulicher Charakterzüge gewonnen** — zum Teil nicht ohne Schuld andrer Völker und im gewissem Sinn auch der Kirche vom Mittelalter an, bis weit in die Neuzeit. Die Verbindung des Judentums mit dem Geld ist eine überaus enge geworden, sodaß der durchaus nicht antisemitische Nietzsche erklären konnte, der junge Börsenjude sei das widerlichste Geschöpf, das es gebe. Nicht minder hat ein Teil des Judentums — wie es der jüdische Dichter Heine repräsentiert —, ein besonderes Maß von Ironie, ja Frechheit in der Behandlung künstlerischer, ethischer, religiöser Probleme betätigt, sodaß die Forderung des Hofpredigers Stöcker schon im Jahre 1878 an diese Juden: „Ein klein wenig bescheidener, ein klein wenig toleranter, ein klein wenig mehr Gleichheit!" sehr wohl berechtigt war. **So wird der christliche Charakter das Judentum nicht als Rasse, nicht als Volk, noch weniger als Religion bekämpfen, sich wohl aber gegen alle unethischen Eigenschaften und Uebergriffe des Judentums energisch wehren, genau so wie gegebenenfalls der eigenen Rasse gegenüber.**

Die übrigen Völker sind Nationen weniger auf Grund gemeinsamen Blutes als gemeinsamer Kultur geworden, d. h. durch Gleichheit der Sprache, der Sitten, des Rechtes und höherer kultureller Güter verbunden. Es entspräche dem Ideal, wenn sich mit der Nation auch die Rechtsgemeinschaft des Staates decken würde. Das aber ist nicht der Fall. Eine große Anzahl von Staaten umschließt verschiedene Nationen und Völker. Nation und Staat miteinander in Deckung zu bringen würde — wie die neuere Entwicklung gerade in Europa zeigt — zu der Bildung von nicht lebensfähigen Zwergstaaten führen. Darum bleibt nur der doppelte Weg übrig, daß entweder im Lauf langsamer und möglichst freier Entwicklung aus getrennten Nationen innerhalb eines Staates sich allmählich eine neue Nation bildet, oder daß man nationalen Minderheiten innerhalb eines Staates kulturelle Autonomie gewährt. Das kann um so leichter geschehen, wenn man die Aufgaben des Staates seinen Angehörigen gegenüber nicht überspannt.

Eine Auffassung des Staates billigt ihm nur negative Funktionen zu, nämlich die Sicherung seiner Bürger nach Innen und Außen und den Schutz ihrer freiheitlichen Betätigung in jeder Rich-

tung. Der Staat hat eigentlich nur eine rechtlich-polizeiliche Aufgabe, oder wie man es noch drastischer formuliert hat, die des Nachtwächters. Das war die ältere liberale Auffassung des Staates, wie sie besonders das 18. Jahrhundert vertrat. Eine entgegengesetzte Auffassung wurzelt in der Antike und hat in neuerer Zeit ihre schärfste Ausprägung bei Hegel gefunden und im Zusammenhang mit diesen bei dem christlichen Theologen R. Rothe. Der letztere sieht im Staat die allumfassende sittlich-religiöse Gemeinschaft, ja sogar die soziale Erscheinungsform des Christentums, in die sich auch die Kirche allmählich aufzulösen hat: „Wo der wahre Staat gegeben ist, da ist von selbst auch das wahre Christentum gegeben und umgekehrt." Diese Auffassung ist nur möglich bei einem Verständnis des Christentums als eines wesentlich innerweltlichen sittlichen Kulturprinzipes, nicht aber als einer religiös transzendenten Größe. **Denn der Staat bleibt wesentlich eine dem irdischen Leben dienende Rechtsorganisation. Darum kann nur in einem sehr bedingten Maße von einem christlichen Staat die Rede sein.** Da das Recht seine letzten Prinzipien aus Sittlichkeit und Religion entnimmt, so wird auch der Staat von diesen Mächten mit beeinflußt werden. Ist ein Volk wesentlich christlich, so wird auch seine staatliche Organisation Spuren davon zeigen. Allein da die meisten Staaten mindestens konfessionell christlich gemischt sind, einige sogar fremde Religionsanhänger umfassen, wird der Staat niemals im innersten Sinne christlich sein können. Der Historiker Treitschke hat darum mit Recht festgestellt: „Unser Staat ist der Staat eines christlichen Volkes, er wird also die christliche Kirche als die allgemeine Kirche bei der Ordnung des bürgerlichen Lebens zur Voraussetzung haben müssen. Trotzdem soll man nicht reden von einem christlichen Staat. Der Staat ist seinem Wesen nach eine weltliche Einrichtung; er muß gerecht sein gegen seine Untertanen ohne Ansehen der Religionen und Konfessionen." **Wie der Staat gegenüber Religion und Kirche eine gewisse Neutralität zu bewahren hat, so hat er sich gegenüber jenen geistigen Erscheinungen, die wir als Kunst und Wissenschaft, als Geselligkeit, Freundschaft und Familie beschrieben, weitgehend zurückzuhalten.** Er wird sich hier wesentlich auf Abwehr von Schädigungen dieser Gemeinschaften und damit des allgemeinen Volkslebens zu beschränken haben.

Positiv hat der Staat seine eigentlichen Leistungen einmal im Wirtschaftsleben — wie schon entwickelt wurde — zu entfalten, dann aber in seiner eigensten Sphäre der Politik. **Im weitesten Sinn verstanden ist Politik die bestmöglichste Staatslenkung nach innen und außen.** Um sie durchzuführen, bilden sich im Staat Organe, die die allen zukommenden Staatsaufgaben berufsmäßig erfüllen und darum mit der notwendigen Macht ausgerüstet werden. Es entsteht **Obrigkeit.** Ohne sie gibt es keinen Staat und damit auch

nicht ohne Untertanen. So wenig wie das allgemeine Priestertum die besondre Existenz von Geistlichen ausschließt, sondern diese geradezu fordert, damit die allen zustehenden religiösen Funktionen auch tatsächlich ausgeübt werden, so müssen gerade unter Voraussetzung der Volkssouveränität besondre Persönlichkeiten mit der Durchführung der staatlichen Funktionen und der dazu nötigen Macht betraut werden. **In solcher Entstehung und Erhaltung der Obrigkeit sieht das Christentum eine Schöpfungs- und damit Gottesordnung.** Ihr ist infolgedessen Gehorsam zu leisten, der sich aber nicht nur in der Befolgung äußerer Anordnungen, in der Zahlung von Abgaben und Steuern betätigen soll. Vielmehr hat der Christ der Obrigkeit auch Ehre zu erweisen, ja ihre schwierige und verantwortungsvolle Tätigkeit auch in seine innerste religiöse Betätigung, in das Gebet, einzubeziehen. Diese Forderung stellt schon Jesus selbst Matth. 22, 21, dann besonders Paulus und Petrus Röm. 13, 1; 1. Tim. 2, 2; 1. Petr. 2, 13 und von den apostolischen Vätern 1. Clem. 61, der schon die Obrigkeit in das allgemeine Kirchengebet hineinnimmt. **Diese positive Stellung des christlichen Charakters zur Obrigkeit bezieht sich auf jedwede Form der Obrigkeit,** die von der natürlichen und geschichtlichen Situation des einzelnen Volkes abhängt. Die beste Obrigkeit ist stets die, welche die besondern Aufgaben einer Nation zu einer bestimmten Zeit am wirksamsten durchzuführen vermag. Das kann ebensogut eine Republik wie eine Monarchie, eine Demokratie wie eine Aristokratie, eine Diktatur wie ein Parlament sein. Der Christ hat als Christ zu keiner dieser Formen als solcher ein prinzipiell bejahendes oder verneinendes Verhältnis. Selbst ein so entschiedener preußischer Monarchist, wie der Historiker Treitschke erklärte: **„Man soll sich hüten, zwischen Republik und Monarchie einen sittlichen Rangunterschied feststellen zu wollen."** Denn alle Formen der Obrigkeit können wechseln. Erfolgt ein solcher Wandel auf gesetzmäßigem Weg, etwa durch Abdankung der bisherigen Obrigkeit oder durch Volksabstimmung, so wird der christliche Charakter zur neuen Obrigkeit ebenso stehen, wie zur alten. Nun aber pflegt ein solcher Wandel öfter auf gewaltsamem Weg, d. h. durch Revolution stattzufinden, einen Vorgang, den ein Rechtshistoriker dahin beschreibt: „Die Ventile funktionieren nicht, infolgedessen platzt der Kessel. Oder nicht im Bild gesprochen: Wenn die rechtliche Zwangsorganisation, Staat, in ihren Grundfesten erschüttert ist, erzwingt sich die in der Rechtsordnung eingedämmte Kraft gewaltsam eine neue Regelung der staatlich rechtlichen Verhältnisse." Mit jenem Vergleich ist schon auf die überindividuelle Notwendigkeit von **Revolutionen** hingedeutet, **die man am besten als Naturkatastrophen in der geschichtlichen Welt bezeichnet.** Damit ist schon einer Betrachtung vorgebeugt, die in jeder Revolution nur private Willkür und Schuld,

sei es bei der früheren Obrigkeit, sei es bei den Revolutionären sieht. Gerade die bei Revolutionen übliche moralische Drapierung und gegenseitige Infamierung darf über die tieferen Notwendigkeiten nicht hinwegblicken lassen. Eine so konservative Persönlichkeit wie Treitschke bezeugt auch hier ein gut Stück Wirklichkeitssinn. „An sich ist eine Revolution immer ein Unrecht, eine gewaltsame Störung der Rechtsordnung, widerspricht der inneren Vernünftigkeit des Staates. Schuldlose Revolutionen kann es daher nicht geben. Aber es hat in der Geschichte immer Revolutionen gegeben und wird es immer wieder geben, bei welchen das moralische Recht auf Seiten der Aufständigen liegt. Der Historiker soll immer ruhig prüfen, ob durch tiefere sittliche Gründe die Revolution historisch gerechtfertigt werden kann. Ueber die Notwendigkeit einer Revolution richtet im letzten Sinn der Erfolg, nicht der brutale augenblickliche Erfolg, sondern die dauernde Verbesserung der Zustände." Diesen Feststellungen entsprechend wird sich der christliche Charakter zu verhalten haben. Ueberschreitet eine Obrigkeit ihr Recht, sonderlich in der religiösen Sphäre, so wird sich der Christ ihr zunächst beugen, **aber gewissenswidrige Forderungen nicht positiv ausführen.** Die Folge davon wird Leiden sein, die der Christ nach Apostelgeschite 4, 9 und nach Luthers Rat passiv ertragen soll. Der Christ wird aber zugleich alle ordnungsmäßigen Wege, die eine Aenderung jener Obrigkeit ermöglichen, auch seinerseits beschreiten. **Gewaltsame Revolutionen wird der Christ von sich aus nicht fördern, wenn er aber zwangsmäßig an ihnen beteiligt wird, sich ihres schuldhaften Charakters bewußt bleiben. Hier liegt wieder ein Fall einer ethisch nicht restlos lösbaren Pflichtenkollision vor.** Gehorsamsverpflichtung gegen vorhandene Obrigkeit tritt in Spannung mit der Notwendigkeit sittlicher Aenderungen im gesamten Staatsleben. Ist durch Revolution eine neue Obrigkeit entstanden, die, wie Paulus sich einmal ausdrückt, tatsächlich die Gewalt hat, dann ist der Christ nicht nur berechtigt, sondern auch verpflichtet, der neuen Obrigkeit Gehorsam in vollem christlichen Umfang zu erweisen. Das braucht ihn nicht zu hindern, an der alten Obrigkeit persönlich zu hängen, und auf gesetzmäßigen Weg für ihre Wiederherstellung einzutreten.

Die Betätigung des Staates und zwar wesentlich der Obrigkeit ist **Politik.** Diese ist die Ausübung einer Kunst, bei der sich natürliche Begabung mit entsprechender, besonders geschichtlicher Bildung zu bester Staatslenkung vereinen sollen. Ihre geistigen Triebräder sind vor allem Klugheit und Macht. **Es erhebt sich die schwere Frage des Verhältnisses der Politik zur Moral überhaupt und zur christlichen im Speziellen.** Man kann hier drei typische Antworten unterscheiden. **Die erstere läßt die Politik** — wenigstens die ideale — **mit der Moral** und — bei Rothe — **sogar mit der christlichen Moral zusammenfallen.** Diese Meinung fällt mit der früher charakterisier-

ten falschen Auffassung des Christentums dahin. Selbst Plato läßt sich seine Moral nur in der Utopie eines Staates, nicht aber in dessen Tatsächlichkeit decken. Gerade die großen Politiker, die auch ethische Persönlichkeiten sein wollten, haben stets die scharfen Spannungen zwischen Ethik und Politik empfunden. Darum ist es begreiflich, daß eine **zweite Meinung Politik und Moral unversöhnliche Gegensätze sein läßt.** In der Politik gilt alles das, was die Moral verwirft, Lüge statt Wahrheit, Hinterlist statt Offenheit, Brutalität statt Bruderliebe. In der Geschichte hat Machiavelli im 16. Jahrhundert diese Position am offensten vertreten. Nach einer **dritten Meinung untersteht die Politik zwar moralischen Prinzipien, aber solchen, die aus dem Wesen des Staates und seinen Notwendigkeiten erwachsen.** Ist das Prinzip des Staats Macht, so ergibt sich für die Politik als sittliches Ziel die Förderung der Macht. Diese Stellungnahme hat wieder Treitschke deutlich formuliert. Er will unterscheiden zwischen privater und öffentlicher Moral. Das sittliche Urteil muß darum in der Politik aus den Lebensgedanken des Staates und nicht des einzelnen Menschen geschöpft werden. Ist dieser aber die Macht, so ist ihre Erhaltung eine unvergleichlich hohe sittliche Aufgabe für den Staat. Darum kommt für diesen Aufopferung und damit eins der Hauptgebote privater Moral nicht in betracht, zumal es in der Geschichte nichts Höheres geben soll, für das ein Staat sich aufopfern kann. Auch Friedr. Naumann, der ehemalige christliche Theologe und spätere hervorragende politische Führer hat sich allmählich zu dieser Meinung bekehrt. Auf die Frage: „Ist der Staat und das Recht ohne Sittlichkeit?“ antwortet er mit einem entschiedenen Nein, distanziert aber diese Staatsmoral entschieden von der christlichen: „Die Nachfolge des Weltgottes ergibt die Sittlichkeit des Kampfes ums Dasein und der Dienst des Vaters Jesu Christi ergibt die Sittlichkeit der Barmherzigkeit. Das Leben braucht beides, die gepanzerte Faust und die Hand Jesu, beides je nach Zeit und Ort.“ **Naumann beruft sich für diese im strengen und ernsten Sinn „Doppelte Moral“ auf Luther.** „Diese lutherische Scheidung der Gebiete, die uns zeitweilig als Verkürzung des Einflußgebietes des Christentums diesem etwas von seinen Rechten zu nehmen schien, hat sich bei tieferer Durchdringung des Stoffes auch für uns als richtig ergeben.“ Diese Berufung auf Luther ist wesentlich berechtigt und entspricht besonders dessen Darlegungen in der Schrift: „Ob Kriegsleute auch im seligen Stand sein können.“ Denn für den äußersten Fall der Politik, den Krieg, bei dem Staatsmoral und christliche Moral am weitesten auseinanderklaffen, unterscheidet Luther zwischen der Amtsmoral, die sich aus der Zugehörigkeit zum Staat und der Privatmoral, die sich aus dem persönlichen Christentum ergibt: „Wenn sie nun von weltlicher Obrigkeit zum Streit gefordert werden, sollen und müssen

sie streiten aus Gehorsam, nicht als Christen, sondern als Glieder und gehorsame Leute nach dem Leib und zeitlichen Gut."

So haben ernste Christen einen Dualismus zwischen politischer und christlicher Moral als Endergebnis konstatiert. Wir können **uns aber damit nicht zufrieden geben, sondern schließen uns einer vierten Meinung an, welche auch auf das staatlich-politische Leben die Anwendung der Grundsätze der christlichen Moral verlangt.** In dieser Richtung liegt die Grundtendenz des Urchristentums, wenn dieses auch keine konkreten Aeußerungen über das Verhältnis von Politik und Moral bringt. Auch der Katholizismus denkt im Prinzip so, wenn er auch tatsächlich die christlich-moralischen Anforderungen an die Politik herabgemindert hat. Vor allem aber ist es der Wille des reformierten Christentums und mancher sogenannter Sekten, wie der Quäker, christliche Politik zu treiben. **Die christlichen Forderungen müssen darum auch in der Politik durchgesetzt und ihnen entsprechend neue Mittel und Wege gesucht werden.** Dabei kann man gewiß an einem vollkommenen Erfolg auf Erden zweifeln. Aber das ist beim Einzelleben genau so der Fall. So wenig bei diesem die zehn Gebote außer Kraft gesetzt werden, weil sie niemand restlos erfüllt, so wenig dürfen die christlichen Grundsätze für die große Politik suspendiert werden, wenn sich auch hier der sündige Widerstand besonders schroff geltend macht.

Von diesem Prinzip aus ergibt sich leicht die Stellung, die unsrer Meinung nach der christliche Charakter zum **Krieg** zu nehmen hat. Wir verzichten auf ihre nähere Darlegung nicht nur aus Raummangel, sondern weil es uns an der Freudigkeit fehlt, gerade diese uns nicht nur theoretisch, sondern praktisch durch viele Jahre schwer bedrängenden Fragen wieder in Angriff zu nehmen. Unter meinen Vorarbeiten befinden sich nicht weniger als ein halbes Hundert von Exzerpten aus Schriften über Krieg und Christentum, die leider nicht selten ein bedauerliches Abweichen von der christlichen Linie bezeugen. Diese gebietet eine entschiedene Ablehnung des Krieges und eine energische Förderung aller Mittel zu seiner Verhütung.

Die Schranken des Unionsprinzips.

Dr. G. Fr. Schuetze.

Zu dieser Stunde, da die Leser des „Magazins" diese Nummer aufschlagen werden, wird — so hoffen wir zu Gott — die Generalkonferenz in Cincinnati die Vereinigung mit der Reformierten Kirche, U. S. ratifiziert haben. Vielleicht liegt auch die konstituierende Versammlung des neuen Kirchenkörpers schon hinter uns im Meer der Vergangenheit. Wir freuen uns der Tatsache, daß das Unionsprinzip der Evangelischen Synode von Nordamerika einen so schönen, durchschlagenden Erfolg erzielt hat; denn es ist ein schönes, biblisches Prinzip, beruhend auf dem Wort des Heilandes, „daß sie alle eins seien" (Joh. 17, 21). Verkehrt wäre es nun, wenn wir jetzt die Hände in den Schoß legen wollten, uns unsrer Errungenschaft freuen und nun auf viele Jahre genug haben wollten. Im Gegenteil. Es gibt noch so manchen Kirchenkörper in den Vereinigten Staaten, mit dem nähere Bekanntschaft, Verbindung und zuletzt auch Verschmelzung möglich und wünschenswert wäre. "In union is strength," das wollen wir nicht vergessen. Daß die katholische Kirche so groß, angesehen und mächtig ist, verdankt sie nicht nur nicht zum geringsten Teil, sondern ganz und gar ihrem Einheitsprinzip, das in dem sichtbaren Gottesreich auf Erden, der Kirche Roms, nicht nur gipfelt, sondern auch darin basiert. Wir haben einen tüchtigen Schritt zu der Einheit des Gottesreiches getan, der uns zwar nicht auf römischen Bahnen zu einem evangelischen Papsttum, wohl aber zum Kommen des Gottesreiches auf Erden führen kann, soll und wird. Wohl wird es noch eine Zeit — hoffentlich nicht zu lange — dauern, bis die beiden sich jetzt verschmelzenden Kirchenkörper so organisch zu einem Ganzen verwachsen sind, daß man nicht mehr sagen kann, dieser kam von links und jener von rechts, der eine aus der Evangelischen Synode und der andre aus der Reformierten Kirche. Dennoch aber dürfen wir keinen Augenblick das hohe Ziel, daß sie alle eins seien, außer Augen lassen, und das betreffende Synodalkomitee darf keinen Augenblick versäumen, nach Vereinigungsmöglichkeiten auszuschauen.

Es entsteht aber sodann sogleich die weitere Frage: mit welchen Kirchenkörpern können und dürfen wir uns vereinigen? Ist das Unionsprinzip der Synode das höchste Ziel? Oder sind noch andre Grundgedanken maßgebend und ausschlaggebend? Mit andern Worten: Hat das Unionsprinzip der Synode irgendwelche Schranken? Und wenn ja, welches sind diese?

Wir brauchen diese Frage nicht als ein Dilemma zu behandeln, sondern wir dürfen ganz ruhig den ersten Satz streichen und dürfen kühnlich behaupten, daß das Unionsprinzip **nicht** das höchste Prin-

zip ist. Es sind Schranken gezogen, innerhalb derer eine Einigkeit im Geist möglich ist; wie der Heiland in dem angegebenen Verse auch die Beschränkung hinzufügt: „gleichwie du, Vater, in mir, und ich in dir." Aber bevor wir auf diese wesentlichen Schranken weiter eingehen, müssen wir kurz die äußerlichen Schranken berühren, die unserm Vereinigungsprinzip gezogen sind.

Es besteht in unserm Land eine interdenominationelle, kirchliche Körperschaft, die sich das Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America nennt. Mit weislicher Beschränkung ist diese Föderation auf unser Land begrenzt. Nicht, als ob das Ziel „der Kirchen Christi auf der Erde" nicht zu erstreben sei. Gewiß ist es das; aber das ist erst die Krönung des ganzen Strebens, die Turmspitze, die das Gebäude der Kirche Christi auf Erden einmal krönen soll. Uns gilt es, erst einmal das Fundament zu legen, damit nicht die geplante „große Brüderunion" (Gerok) wie Muhameds Sarg in der Luft schwebe, zwischen Himmel und Erde, ohne auf festem Boden gegründet und ohne an den Himmel angekettet zu sein. So wie der Weltlauf geht, wird die Vereinigung der ganzen Welt zu einer Kirche doch einmal kommen. Christus hat es verheißen, und auf den Missionsfeldern geschieht es schon jetzt, daß die denominationellen Sonderheiten gänzlich zurücktreten und eine Vereinigung der Kirchen in die Wege geleitet ist. Ist doch auch unsre Synode schon in Canada, Honduras und Indien vertreten und nach der Verschmelzung mit der Reformierten Kirche auch in Japan, Afrika und wo die Reformierte Kirche noch sonst Missionsgebiete haben mag. Wie gesagt, das sind die unausbleiblichen Folgen der Mission, einstweilen aber werden wir weise handeln, uns mit unsern Unionsbestrebungen auf unser eigenes Land zu beschränken, wie auch Goethe sagt: „In der Beschränkung zeigt sich erst der Meister."

Wenn wir aber nun auf die wichtigsten Schranken, die innerlichen, elementaren, essentiell bedingten, eingehen, so darf uns wieder das Wort des Meisters den Fingerzeig geben, wenn er sagt: ich in dir und du in mir. Das hat auch das Föderalkonzil eingesehen, da es in seinem Namen die Beschränkung aufgenommen hat: **Kirchen Christi.** Also ist eine Verbindung ausgeschlossen mit allen solchen Gemeinschaften (wir sagen mit Bedacht nicht Kirchen), die nicht an Jesus Christus glauben. Gott bewahre uns vor dem verwaschenen Synkretismus der rationalistischen Zeit, der mit Begeisterung sang: Wir glauben all an einen Gott, Jud, Heide, Christ und Hottentott.

Um uns aber vor Irrwegen zu bewahren, müssen wir diesen Glauben an Jesum Christum noch genauer definieren. Auch der Islam nimmt Jesum als einen Propheten Gottes an, und dennoch wäre eine Vereinigung mit der Gemeinschaft des „falschen Prophe-

ten" auf ewig undenkbar. Warum? Weil der fundamentale Satz fehlt: Gottes Sohn und Erlöser der Menschheit. Der Mormonismus ist eine moderne Form des sinnlichen Heidentums, über den in unserm Zusammenhang zu reden sich nicht verlohnt. Die These der Gottessohnschaft schließt dann auch weiter sofort aus die angeblich christlichen Gemeinschaften der Unitarier und Universalisten, die in Christo wohl den weisen Meister und Lehrer, den Mann von Gott gesandt, verehren, aber nicht das Fleisch gewordene Wort Gottes.

Und noch sind die Schranken zu weit. Es genügt uns nicht, daß wir in unserm offiziellen Glaubensbekenntnis den zweiten Artikel haben, während er in der Praxis ganz und gar außer Acht gelassen wird. Wir wollen mit diesem Wort Fehde ansagen, in welcher Form und Gestalt er uns auch entgegentritt, sei es unter dem Misnomer Soziales Evangelium, sei es in der Bestreitung der Göttlichkeit Christi, sei es sonst noch, was es wolle. Wohl müssen wir zu unserm Kummer selbst in unsrer eigenen Synode, besonders in der jüngeren Generation, eine solche „liberale" Tendenz bemerken; aber so lange diese Tendenz nicht glaubensbindend ist, dürfen wir sie wohl als eine theologische Kinderkrankheit ansehen, die in der furchtbaren Verantwortlichkeit des Amtslebens früher oder später überwunden wird. Das Verantwortungsbewußtsein des praktischen Amtes ist denn auch wohl die Ursache, daß wir viel leichter einen älteren liberalen akademischen Lehrer finden können, als einen älteren liberalen Landpastor. Und selbst unter den Professoren tritt mit dem zunehmenden Alter immer mehr eine Tendenz nach rechts zu Tage. Aus unsrer eigenen Studentenzeit erinnern wir uns sehr wohl noch des begeistert hinreißenden jungen Professors Ad. Harnack. Vergleichen wir ihn aber mit dem älteren Mann, so nehmen wir ganz deutlich wahr die von ihm ausgegebene Parole: Zurück zum Evangelium. Um aber auf das praktische geistliche Amt zurückzukommen, woher kommt es, daß die Liberalen oder Modernisten hauptsächlich unter dem jüngeren Geschlecht zu finden sind, daß aber, je länger der Pastor im praktischen Amt steht, die liberale Denkart mehr und mehr in den Hintergrund tritt, bis sie ganz verschwindet? Der Liberalismus unsrer Kirche ist, sit venia verbo, zu vergleichen mit dem Keuchhusten oder den Masern, die man einmal gehabt haben muß, um in späteren Jahren dagegen immun zu sein. Ganz anders aber wird die Sachlage, wenn ein Kirchenkörper ohne ein Bekenntnis zu dem Erlöser oder überhaupt ohne ein klares Bekenntnis zum Sohn Gottes auftritt und doch den Anspruch erhebt, seiner Gefolgschaft Brot des Lebens zu reichen. Da dürfen wir an keine Vereinigung denken, bis der betreffende Kirchenkörper klar und deutlich seine Stellung zu dem Welterlöser, dem Sohn Gottes, ausspricht. **Erst dann** und **nur dann** kann eine Vereinigung in den Bereich der Möglichkeiten gezogen werden.

Aber noch immer sind die Schranken zu weit. Wohl sagt der Prophet: Mache den Raum deiner Hütte weit (Jes. 54, 2); aber doch gibt es Grenzen, die wir nicht überschreiten dürfen und können. Vor Jahren hatte der Schreiber dieser Zeilen einmal eine Unterredung mit einem lutherischen Präses über eine mögliche Vereinigung. Als ich die Möglichkeit gern zugab, sagte er: „Aber dann müssen Sie ja alle lutherisch werden." Meine Antwort war: „Mit Freuden, so wie sich die Lutherische Kirche auf den ersten Teil ihres Namens besinnt und recht evangelisch wird." Und da hapert es. So viele Kirchen leiden unter dem, was man heutzutage in der Psychologie einen superiority complex nennt. Sie danken Gott, wenn auch nicht mit den kahlen Worten, daß sie nicht sind wie andre Kirchen, Presbyterianer, Reformierte oder gar wie diese „Unierten." Sie sind gern und mit Freuden bereit, sich mit irgendeinem Kirchenkörper zu vereinigen, vorausgesetzt, der andre Teil kommt in „seines Nichts durchbohrendem Gefühle" zu ihnen, sagt Pater, peccavi und laudabiliter subjicit. Wir aber halten dafür, daß die besonderen Eigenheiten der verschiedenen Kirchen historisch entstanden sind, also darum von Gott zugelassen, daß sie zum allerwenigstens das Anrecht auf historische Beachtung haben, daß jede einzelne Sonderkirche ihre besondre Mission der Verkörperung einer besondern Seite der Heilsökonomie hat oder wenigstens einmal hatte, daß also alle diese Eigentümlichkeiten nicht mit einem Federstrich beseitigt werden können und dürfen. Soweit solche Eigentümlichkeiten nicht widerbiblisch sind, sind sie mit Achtung zu bewahren und nur im äußersten Notfall mit Schonung zu verändern. Ein Luther selbst hat sich stets geweigert, historisch Gewordenes, wie Glocken, Kerzen und dergleichen aus der Kirche zu verbannen. Ueberhaupt ist ja Luthers Gottesdienstordnung ganz auf der katholischen Messe aufgebaut, nachdem alles Unbiblische und unnötige Wiederholungen beseitigt waren.

Aus allen diesen Erwägungen ziehen wir den Schluß, daß eine Vereinigung mit einem Kirchenkörper unmöglich ist, wenn er nur geschehen kann unter Aufgabe alles und jedes Evangelischen Charakters. Weitere Schranken aber vermögen wir nicht anzuerkennen. Mit irgendeiner Kirche, die mit uns auf dem Fundamentalartikel des Glaubens an den für uns gekreuzigten und auferstandenen Sohnes Gottes steht, und die bereit ist, unsern besonderen Evangelischen Kirchencharakter zu respektieren, ist eine Verständigung und letzten Endes eine Vereinigung möglich. Kleinere Fragen, wie ob Brot oder Hostien, Formen des Gottesdienstes usw. müssen zu den Adiaphora gerechnet werden und können und dürfen nicht kirchentrennend wirken.

Das Unionsprinzip marschiert. Immer mehr Kirchenkörper vereinigen sich zu größeren Gemeinschaften. Wir sehen im Geist

die Zeit voraus — freilich wir selber werden sie nicht mehr erleben, vielleicht auch unsre Kinder noch nicht, wohl aber die dritte oder vierte Generation — wo es in Amerika nur noch drei christliche Kirchen geben wird, die katholische, die Walthersche (vulgo missourische) und die dritte, die große Unionskirche. Alle andern Kirchen werden sich teilen und je nach der Seite, nach welcher sie gravitieren, in das katholische, missourische oder evangelische Lager übergehen. Da ist die anglikanische Kirche, in der wir eine Spaltung voraussehen. Die Anhänger der High Church werden nach Rom zurückfließen, während die Low und die Broad Church sich auf die evangelische Seite schlagen werden. Auch in der lutherischen Kirche wird es soweit kommen, daß alle Befürworter der „reinen Lehre und Leere" sich um das Banner Walthers sammeln, während der vernünftige Teil der vielen lutherischen Synoden zur Unionskirche übergehen wird, die wir — mag sie einmal heißen wie sie will — einstweilen als die protestantisch-evangelische bezeichnen wollen: protestantisch, weil sie abweist alles Menschliche, Unbiblische, Widergöttliche und evangelisch, weil sie als den positiven Teil ihres Bekenntnisses festhält an dem Grund, der zuvor gelegt ist, und außer dem niemand einen andern legen kann, weil sie sich bekennt zu dem lebendigen Glauben an Jesum Christum, den wahren Gott und wahren Menschen in einer Person, den Heiland, Erlöser und Herrn. Möge diese Zeit, die Vorstufe des verwirklichten Reiches Gottes auf Erden, bald kommen. Ja komme bald. Amen, ja komm, Herr Jesu!

Wesen und Aufgabe der deutschen Kultur.

Von Dr. Georg L. Scherger, evang. Pastor, Chicago, Ill.

I.

Der Ausdruck „deutsche Kultur" war eins der Hauptschlagworte des großen Weltkrieges. Gleich zu Anfang wurde gegen das deutsche Volk die Anschuldigung erhoben, daß es der ganzen Welt seine Kultur aufdrängen wollte. Die Deutschen selbst wiesen diese Beschuldigung bestimmt zurück und behaupteten, daß sie nie die Bedeutung englischer, französischer oder italienischer Kultur unterschätzt hätten. Nur im Vergleich mit dem russischen Barbarismus fühlten sie die Ueberlegenheit der deutschen Kultur; und indem sie gezwungen waren, gegen die wilden Kolonialtruppen zu kämpfen, schien es ihnen, als ob sie für die Wahrung ihrer heiligsten Güter kämpften. Nie hatten sie behauptet, daß die deutsche Kultur alle Kulturen ersetzen muß. Im Gegenteil. Kein anders Volk hatte fremden Kultureinflüssen tieferes Verständnis und Interesse entgegengebracht. Im Herzen Europas gelegen, war Deutschland stets in enger Berührung mit seinen Nachbarn geblieben. Kein anders Land hat deshalb eine so eklektische Kultur oder einen solchen kosmopolitischen Geist wie das deutsche.

Lehrt die Geschichte nicht, daß es seit der Völkerwanderung der Fluch der Deutschen gewesen ist, daß sie so wenig Selbstgefühl besaßen und so sehr ihre eigene Größe unterschätzen, und daß sie stets allzu bereit waren, ihre eigene Sprache, Sitten und Gebräuche preiszugeben, um fremdländisches Wesen anzunehmen? Haben nicht ganze Völkerschaften, wie Ost- und Westgoten, Vandalen, Longobarden und Franken ihre Identität vollständig verloren, weil sie allzuschnell auf keltisch-römisches Wesen eingingen? Und wie viele Millionen Auswanderer sind in den letzten hundert Jahren dem deutschen Vaterland verloren gegangen und haben das Ausland bereichert durch ihre Intelligenz, Sparsamkeit und Arbeitsamkeit! Gibt es irgendeine andre Nationalität, die sich hier in Amerika so rasch einlebte und assimilierte wie die Deutschen, die man als Bindestrichler verschrie? Wie huldigten die Deutschen im 18. Jahrhundert dem französischen Wesen und im 19. dem englischen! Wo wurde der Ausländer mit gleicher Zuvorkommenheit behandelt wie in Deutschland? Wosonst fanden ausländische Künstler ein so dankbares Publikum? Wo sonst wurden ausländische Bücher so rasch übertragen und so gerne gelesen? Haben nicht Männer wie Shakespeare, Byron, Dickens, Mark Twain und Edgar Allen Poe größere Anerkennung in Deutchland gefunden als in ihrem eigenen Land?

Deutschland hat nie auf das Ausland herabgesehen oder sich gegen dasselbe abgeschlossen in dem Maße, wie England dies getan

hat. Es war immer bereit, vom Ausland zu lernen. So empfing der große Kant mächtige Anregung von Rousseau, Hume und Locke und baute ihre Gedanken zu einem System aus. Haeckel und Weismann erkannten die Bedeutung des Darwinismus. Manche Erfindung des Auslandes wurde von den Deutschen sofort aufgenommen und vervollkommnet. Klopstocks Worte an Deutschland lauten:

„Nie war gegen das Ausland
Ein anderes Land gerecht wie du,
Sei nicht allzu gerecht!
Sie denken nicht edel genug,
Zu sehn wie schön dein Fehler ist."

Deutschland kannte seine Nachbarn immer viel besser, wie es von diesen erkannt wurde. Wenn irgendein Volk hochmütig gesinnt ist und mit souveräner Verachtung auf alles Fremdländische herabblickt, so ist dies das englische Volk und nicht das deutsche. Das Wort „Foreigner" hat in England denselben Beigeschmack wie das Wort „Barbar" bei den Griechen. Den höchsten Ruhm spendet man in England, wenn man von einem Mann sagt: „He is quite an Englishman." Der Engländer lernt aus Prinzip keine fremden Sprachen. Mag die Welt englisch werden — das wäre für ihn viel bequemer. Besonders das Vorkriegs-Deutschland war dem Engländer und leider auch dem Amerikaner „terra incognita."

Bei dieser völligen Unkenntnis deutschen Wesens seitens der Engländer darf man sich auch nicht wundern, daß es lange dauerte, bis sie die Bedeutung des Wortes „Kultur" kennen lernten. Sie verglichen es mit ihrem Wort „Culture," das nicht mit K buchstabiert wird und behaupteten, daß der Deutsche keine „Culture" besäße. Sie verstehen die deutsche Sprache nicht genug, um zu wissen, daß diese ein Wort besitzt, das Bildung heißt, das genau dasselbe bedeutet, wie das englische Wort „Culture"; während das deutsche Wort „Kultur" sich mit dem englischen und französischen Wort „Civilisation" deckt. „Culture" oder Bildung bezieht sich auf den einzelnen und ist subjektiv. Kultur oder „Civilisation" hingegen bezeichnet etwas, das außerhalb des Individuums besteht, also etwas Objektives.

Es ist Unsinn zu behaupten, daß die Deutschen keine „Culture" im englischen Sinn des Wortes besitzen. Es gibt kein Land, wo Bildung höher geschätzt wird und allgemeiner verbreitet ist, als in Deutschland. Man kann dort kein vernichtenderes Urteil über jemanden fällen, als ihn „ungebildet" zu nennen. Man darf das deutsche Volk als das gebildetste Volk bezeichnen aus folgenden Gründen: Erstens gibt es in Deutschland weniger Analphabeten als in irgendeinem andern Land. Dann ist in Deutschland der durchschnittliche Bildungsgrad höher als sonstwo. Das deutsche Volk

liest mehr Bücher, besonders gelehrte Werke, wie irgendein andres. Sodann ist auch das deutsche Erziehungswesen das beste in der Welt und ist heute noch das Vorbild für alle andern Nationen. Während England heute immer noch kein richtiges Volksschulsystem hat, reicht die Entstehung der deutschen Volksschule zurück ins Reformationszeitalter. Wie viel verdanken die Vereinigten Staaten dem deutschen Schulsystem! Was wäre unsre amerikanische Pädagogik ohne den Einfluß deutscher Erzieher wie Herbart, Ziller, Rein, Hegel? Unsre besten amerikanischen Universitäten sind nach deutschem Muster organisiert, besonders Hochschulen wie Harvard, John Hopkins, Chicago und besonders unsre Staatsuniversitäten. Ueberall finden wir deutsche Methoden, wie z. B. die Einrichtung von Laboratorien; die Erteilung des Doktorgrades der Philosophie, den man in England nicht erteilt; die Doktordissertation; das fleißige Studium der Quellen im Geschichtsunterricht. Unsre amerikanischen Psychologen sind fast sämtlich Schüler Wundts, Stumpfs oder Külpes. Die großen Historiker Amerikas und Englands, besonders Bancroft, Motley, Freeman, Stubbs, Gardiner sind Schüler der deutschen Historiographie. Die Philosophen und Theologen Amerikas, Englands und Schottlands haben wenig Originelles geleistet und haben sich fast gänzlich beschränkt auf eine Wiedergabe der Resultate deutscher Forschung. Verdanken nicht englische Schriftsteller wie Coleridge, Sir Walter Scott, George Eliot, Mathew Arnold ihre Inspiration dem deutschen Geist? Wie groß war die Verehrung Carlyles für alles deutsche Wesen! Noch kurz vor Ausbruch des Krieges sagte Lord Haldane: „Germany is my Spiritual Home." Mathew Arnold, den man als Apostel englischer „Culture" betrachten kann, und der dies Wort in England erst recht heimisch macht, steht ganz unter dem Einfluß Goethes und des deutschen Ideals der Klassikerperiode. Das deutsche Bildungsideal ist eine Weiterbildung des alten griechischen, wie man ja die Deutschen als die Griechen der Neuzeit betrachten kann. Es wird wohl nie möglich sein, dieses Ideal zu verdrängen oder zu verbessern, denn Höheres kann man nicht erstreben, als diese wahre Humanität und schöne Menschlichkeit, diese allseitige und harmonische Entwicklung aller menschlichen Kräfte, wie die großen deutschen Klassiker sie erstrebten. Die großen Geisteshelden Deutschlands, wie Herder, Lessing, Schiller, Goethe, Kant, und nicht die Engländer, haben zuerst dies herrliche Ideal formuliert und zum Hauptmotiv des Lebens gesetzt. Dieser Ruhm darf nicht von ihnen genommen werden. Wahre Geistes- und Herzensbildung kann unmöglich erhabener gekennzeichnet werden, als in den Worten Goethes, wenn er sagt, daß unser höchstes Glück als Menschen darin bestehe: „Im Ganzen, Guten, Schönen resolut zu leben," oder in den Worten Schillers: „Edel sei der Mensch, hilfreich und gut."

Die deutsche Bildung ist gründlich. England aber ist das Land der Halbbildung. „We are a nation of amateurs," sagte unlängst ein hervorragender Engländer. Es mag sein, daß man in Deutschland manchmal die Fachgelehrsamkeit überschätzt. Ich will auch nicht leugnen, daß in England Männer wie Gibbon, Grote, John Morley, Herbert Spencer und andre, die nicht zur gelehrten Zunft gehörten, Großes geleistet haben. Im großen und ganzen jedoch herrscht in England der Dilettantismus und die Mittelmäßigkeit und zwar auf allen Gebieten. Wie trocken und engherzig war zum Beispiel der Stockengländer Herbert Spencer, der sich rühmte, keine Sprache außerhalb der englischen zu kennen. Während gewisse englische Denker wie Locke, Darwin, Hobbes, Newton, Spencer oft große Originalität besaßen und wesentlich neue Gesichtspunkte aufstellten, war ihr Gesichtskreis oft ein beschränkter wegen ihrer Insularität. Es mangelten ihnen oft eben jene allseitige Ausbildung, jene vielseitigen Interessen, jenes universale Wissen, welches wir bei deutschen Gelehrten finden vom Schlag eines Leibniz, eines Kant, eines Hegel, eines Alexander von Humboldt, eines Goethe, eines Helmholtz, eines Mommsen. Es ist fraglich, ob England überhaupt seit Shakespeare und Milton ein einziges Universalgenie hervorgebracht hat.

II.

Nachdem ich versucht habe, den englischen Begriff „Culture" zu erörtern, komme ich nun zum deutschen Wort „Kultur." Wenn der Deutsche von seiner Kultur spricht, meint er die materiellen Errungenschaften seines Volkes. Man kann unterscheiden, Geisteskultur und materielle Kultur. Geisteskultur umfaßt die intellektuelle, religiöse, ethische, politische, soziale und künstlerische Entwicklung, während die materielle Kultur es mit der technischen, industriellen und gewerblichen Entwicklung zu tun hat. Die Kulturgeschichte behandelt das Werden der Kultur nach diesen verschiedenen Seiten. Nun die deutsche Sprache besitzt dieses bequeme Wort, das man im Englischen und Französischen mit „History of Civilization" („L'histoire de la civilisation") übersetzt.

Es ist natürlich unmöglich, das gewaltige Gebiet der deutschen Kulturgeschichte in den Rahmen eines Aufsatzes zu zwängen. Wir müssen uns bescheiden mit dem Versuch zu erklären, was die Ideale des deutschen Volkes sind und wie sich dieselben als treibende Kräfte in der Entwicklung des deutschen Wesens erzeugt haben. Im selben Sinn wie Montesquieu vom Geist der Gesetze und Savigny vom Geist des römischen Rechts reden, wollen wir reden vom Geist der deutschen Kultur.

Der erste Charakterzug der deutschen Kultur ist tiefe Innerlichkeit.

Alles Oberflächliche ist dem Deutschen widerwärtig. Er zieht das Gediegene dem Prunkhaften vor. Er dringt auf Sein, nicht auf Schein, und verabscheut alles Strebertum. Bescheidenheit wird in Deutschland jedem Kind gepredigt. Vielleicht allzusehr. Etwas mehr Selbstgefühl könnte dem Deutschen nicht schaden. Er kann hierin viel vom Engländer und vom Irländer lernen. Auch in Amerika hat das deutsche Element lange nicht die Rolle gespielt, die es hätte spielen sollen wegen der numerischen Zahl und der Tüchtigkeit der Deutschamerikaner. Sie haben sich lange aus allzu großer Bescheidenheit im Hintergrund gehalten. Auch hier scheint wenigstens stellenweise eine Wendung eingetreten zu sein. Warum sollen die Engländer und Irländer immer obenan stehen? Sie wirtschaften oft mit einem viel kleineren Kapital von Tüchtigkeit, aber ihre Maschine trägt gewöhnlich ein lautes Horn.

Die deutsche Innerlichkeit offenbart sich auch in den religiösen und moralischen Anschauungen des Deutschen. Seine Sprache ist die einzige, die das schöne Wort „Gemüt" besitzt. Der Deutsche muß in ein inniges persönliches Verhältnis zu Gott und der Welt treten. Dies zeigt sich in der deutschen Mystik eines Meisters Eckhart, Tauler, Jakob Böhme. Auch bei Luther, Zinzendorf, August Hermann Francke, Schleiermacher, Tholuck hat sich diese Tendenz erhalten. Sie findet die Religion nicht in äußeren Formen, Zeremonien und Lehrsätzen, sondern im Innern des Menschen. Die Seele soll unmittelbar mit Gott in Verbindung treten und mit ihm vereint sein. „Will die Seele Frieden und Freiheit des Herzens in einer stillen Ruhe finden," schreibt Meister Eckhart, „so muß sie wieder heimrufen alle ihre Kräfte und sie sammeln von allen zerstreuten Dingen in ein inwendiges Wirken."

Schleiermacher, der Vater der modernen Theologie, sagt in den Reden über die Religion, daß von jeher der Glaube nicht jedermanns Ding gewesen ist; daß die meisten Menschen mit den Umhüllungen der Religion gaukelten, während nur wenige das Wesen derselben erkannt hätten. (Er findet, daß die Religion im Herzen oder Gemüt und nicht im Kopf, ihren Sitz hat.) Auch Bengel sagt: „Pectus est quod theologum facit." Der Deutsche muß wirklich, wie ihm die Engländer vorgeworfen haben, einen deutschen Gott haben, das heißt einen Gott, zu dem er in ein kindliches, persönliches Verhältnis treten kann. Religion ist ihm Geist und Leben, nicht totes Formenwesen. In diesem Sinn hat Fichte Recht, wenn er die Deutschen „das Volk des Gemüts" nennt.

Auch eine Weltanschauung muß der Deutsche haben, und wieder ist es charakteristisch, daß nur seine Sprache dies Wort besitzt. Er will in der Welt sich zu Hause fühlen. Sie soll ihm zum Heim werden, nicht bloß ein Gasthaus sein. „Wie ist doch die Erde so schön," singt er. Er liebt die Bäume und den Wald und die freie

Gottesnatur, wie seine vielen herrlichen Waldeslieder bezeugen. Er liebt die Blumen und die Vögel. Es ist nicht eine fremde Welt, sondern seine eigene. Ja, der deutsche Idealismus Kants und Fichtes behauptet, daß jeder sich seine eigene Welt erschaffen muß. Kant behauptet, daß nicht der Verstand seine Gesetze aus der Natur empfängt, sondern vielmehr seine Gesetze der Natur vorschreibt, oder daß die Dinge sich nach unsern Begriffen richten, nicht unsre Begriffe nach den Dingen. Kant verlegte hiermit den Schwerpunkt ins Subjekt, nicht ins Objekt.

Auch die deutsche Moral ist subjektiv. Der Deutsche will nicht handeln aus äußerem Zwang, sondern aus eigenem, innerem Antrieb. Er verlangt volle Freiheit in seinem Tun und Lassen. In der Kantschen Moral wird betont, daß das Individuum sein eigener Gesetzgeber ist und daß das Moralgesetz in seinem Innern zu suchen ist. Der gute Wille ist das Entscheidende, nicht das äußere Gebot. Kant sagt: „Es ist überall nichts in der Welt, ja überhaupt auch außer derselben zu denken möglich, was ohne Einschränkung für gut könnte gehalten werden, als allein ein guter Wille." Kant begründet somit den deutschen Begriff der moralischen Freiheit aus dem Innern des Menschen. Persönlichkeit ist ihm Freiheit und Unabhängigkeit vom Mechanismus der ganzen Natur. Charakter definiert er als „diejenige Eigenschaft des Willens, nach welcher das Subjekt sich selbst an bestimmte praktische Prinzipien bindet, die es sich durch seine eigene Vernunft unabänderlich vorgeschrieben hat." Dieser Kantsche Begriff der moralischen Freiheit ist tief eingedrungen in den Charakter des deutschen Volkes. Es ist eigentlich derselbe Begriff, wie wir ihn bei Luther finden, wenn er redet von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen vom äußeren Gesetz. Es ist dies der wahre evangelische Geist, wie ihn Christus und Paulus kennzeichnen. Das Puritanertum Englands und Amerikas hat wenig von diesem germanischen und evangelischen Geist, denn es bezeichnet ein Zurückfallen in den engen juristischen Standpunkt des Mosaismus. Leider lebt dieser alttestamentliche Geist noch fort in Amerika, und offenbart sich in der Tendenz, die Menschen zu zwingen, gut zu werden.

Abdruck aus der Festschrift des „Deutschen Tages,"
Chicago, 13. August 1933.

EDITORIALS

THE FUTURE OF THE THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

The General Board of Publication, at its meeting of August 22, 1933, left a bombshell on our premises that disturbed the peace of our editorial mind quite considerably. It passed a resolution as follows: "We recommend to discontinue publishing such periodicals of which the bare cost of production exceeds the receipts, such as "Kinderzeitung," "Feierstunden" and "Theological Magazine."

It astonished us that in this resolution "the Theological Magazine" was put in the same category with "Feierstunden" and "Kinderzeitung" although these two latter papers owe their precarious condition to the decline of the German language in our Sunday school work, a consideration which does not apply to the "Magazine." Still more were we surprised that the resolution is so worded as though these three papers were all of the same importance or, rather, as though they were all of the same unimportance and could be equally well missed in our Synodical household.

Of course the Editor, being present at that meeting of the Board, fought the resolution to the best of his ability. In the first place, he declared that the existence of the "Magazine" should not be made dependent on the question of whether it paid for itself. It had never been a paying venture in all of the sixty years of its life. Nor had any other Church ever produced a similar paper without financial loss. The Synod had kept it because of the inspiration and information its clergy derived from it and because of the chance it gave for scholarly work of our own.

Besides, there were a great many other papers on our list, especially in the Sunday school field, that showed considerable loss and yet were not condemned to death. We could go elsewhere and have our literature produced more cheaply there. But we didn't do that. We felt that we could furnish our people the kind of reading that was more adapted to their needs and tradition. Why not apply the same standard to the "Theological Magazine"?

Of course, the Editor continued, the "Magazine" has lost readers. But so have other papers. At the beginning of the year our loss was six percent, while other papers of ours had lost fifteen and even twenty percent.

However, one of the chief reasons why the "Magazine" should not be discontinued now, is the fact that at the General Conference we are going to unite with the Reformed Church and that as a result we may find there a large field of possible growth. The Reformed Church has 1,366 ministers. They have no theological paper of this kind. Is it not natural to expect a good deal of support from them for ours? In this connection the editor read to the Board a letter he had received from Dr. Geo. W. Richards, the president of the Reformed Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa. and one of the first-rank men of that Church. Dr. Richards wrote as follows:

Lancaster, Pa., Aug. 7, 1933.

Dear Dr. Kamphausen:

I was pleased to receive yours of the 4th inst. I thank you for the allusion to my work at the Belfast Alliance. I am especially interested in your proposal that we join after the union in advancing the "Theological Magazine" which you are now publishing. I had not given the matter any thought as yet. Now that you suggest it, it seems to me *quite feasible* to make the *"Theological Magazine"* the *organ* of the *United Church*. We ought at least to procure a thousand subscribers even at this time of depression. We shall not have any trouble in getting a joint board of editors (associate). At present we have no theological review in the Reformed Church. The *"Theological Magazine"* of your Church would *naturally* be the paper that *we would all unite on*. Of course little could be done before the union is effected. It will not be difficult to take up these matters after the union.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Dr. Geo. W. Richards,
Pres. Theol. Seminary of the
Reformed Church.

I can't see how, after hearing this letter, any one can hesitate to grasp the hand which the Reformed Church thus (through Dr. Richards) extends to us in this matter. The Reformed Church has its own weekly church-papers. They will keep them after the union, just as we keep ours. But the "Theological Magazine," being the only one in the field and getting the support of the Reformed brethren, will be the paper that the clergy of both churches will read. It will then be a great medium in the unionizing process which will, as we hope, go on after the General Conferences have spoken. It will help the ministers of both churches to grow in the unity of the spirit and thus pave the way to a union not only organic but spiritual also.

The Board of Publication, in its majority could not be swayed by such arguments. We trust the General Conference will.* In fact, we have been assured by brethren weighty in influence and close to the mind of our ministry that General Conference will not want the "Theological Magazine" to die. While we write this it is September second and therefore we cannot tell what is going to happen. When this number gets into the hands of the readers they all will know what has happened. The Editor hopes to be sustained by General Conference.

May his hope materialize and he be able to see some of the large possibilities turned into realities!

EXPERIENCE IN RELIGION

It may be an exaggeration to say that Barthianism is the greatest spiritual movement since Schleiermacher (see "A Conservative looks to Brunner and Barth," Book Review page 479). Still it looks as though the father of that movement was giving the theologians all over the world a great deal of concern. America seems to be the only place where he has not yet made a very deep impression. In an informing article in the July issue of the "Magazine," M. Manrodt has tried to explain why the American pastor has so far failed to benefit by the "dialectic" theology. Aside from the difficulties of style and the strangeness of viewpoint, Barth is in many ways a pessimist, and the Americans are born optimists. Then they apply to all things and movements the pragmatic standard. They always ask, does it work? And Barth's theology doesn't work in the ordinary sense. It doesn't make the pastor a popular speaker. It doesn't help him in his various organizations; doesn't make the congregation grow, nor does it lift the minister to a favorite place on the program of the rotarians or secret societies.

There is good reason for Barth calling his theology a theology of crisis. To him modern theology is in a critical stage, in a period of dissolution, and this applies to the conservative theology almost as much as to the liberal. Of course it is especially true of the liberal. Barth was brought up in the liberal camp. He still has very liberal views on Bible criticism. But otherwise he has shed the liberal ideas of his theological youth. Jesus is to liberal theology the God-inspired man who by his example and teachings helps us to develop the potential divinity that is in all of us. The Liberal seeks to acquire the faith, the God-consciousness that was in Jesus; he is not interested in the faith about Jesus. He doesn't believe that Jesus started with a different natural endowment which made it possible for him to live the life he lived and be the man he was. Barth is correct, we believe, in saying that in liberal theology Jesus

* General Conference voted to continue the Theological Magazine. Ed.

became divine. Barth says, Jesus was divine from the beginning, in him the Word, the second person of the Trinity, became flesh.

Barth says, the Liberals are ashamed of theology; to them theology means faith in the Trinity, the virgin birth, the atonement, the physical resurrection of Jesus. Barth believes in all these things; he is proud of being a theologian. They are interested in Christ's teachings, in his way of life. Barth is interested in what Jesus was, in his divine person. Because he was God, his life, his death, his resurrection and his teachings are invested with absolute value and authority.

We could go on for a good while pointing out where Barth clashes with liberal theology. But in this editorial we want to stress the points where he differs from the Conservatives. Not only does he give the critics of the Bible almost unlimited play, saying that in the Bible truth and fiction are wondrously interwoven; not only does he assume an independent position on the creeds, claiming they are expressions, not objects of faith, not judicial standards of a man's orthodoxy. The point where we most decidedly diverge from him, is in his judgment of *experience* and its place in religion. For him to trust in experience is to introduce a human element into our faith. Religion is always the movement of God towards man, he says, never the movement of man towards God. According to him it was Schleiermacher who started theology on a wrong course when he based it on the religious consciousness of the Christians. Schleiermacher called his dogmatics the Christian Faith, he made it man-centered. Barth on the other hand, put in its place the objective *Word of God;* made his theology God-centered.

Barth's opposition does not stop with Schleiermacher and his school; nor with the Erlangen "experience-theology." He is if possible even more antagonistic to the Pietists and Methodists. Faith, he claims, has nothing to do with pious feelings or with religious experience. It is not trust (fiducia) but a symbol of a transcendent act of God (see Zerbe's book on Barth, Book Review, March, 1931, page 151). The Methodists and Pietists, says Zerbe, Barth seems to regard with particular aversion. "Rather with the church in hell, than with pietists of lower or higher rank in a heaven that does not exist." In this connection we quote Brunner, too. He says contemptuously, "As if conversion were the process whereby a sinful man is actually transformed into a Christian man!"

Now we believe that feelings play a very important role in religion. The Pietists under Spener and Francke gave religious feelings a legitimate place over against intellectual assent. Their faith was fiducia (in Luther's sense) in its very essence. Under

Francke's statue (in the "Franckeschen Stiftungen" at Halle) it says: "He trusted in God." That explained his whole life and career. John Weslay, when listening to Luther's Preface to Romans felt himself "strangely warmed." That was a religious feeling but his conversion experience of this kind was the fountain out of which the divine life burst into his own and enabled him to "spread the contagion of holy living" over a continent.

Our own denomination owes its origin and growth to the men who in the second period of Pietism were "converted to the shepherd and bishop of their souls" (1 Pet. 2: 25). Our literature contains the story of the lives of many of them. Their conversion experience is really the only thing they have to tell. Shall we say they were all mistaken in attributing so much importance to an uprush of religious feeling? Or did their character and life authenticate the genuineness of their experience?

This writer grew up in the pietistic atmosphere of the Lower Rhineland, where Tersteegen was born and where he was still revered. He then passed through a religious institution in the "Ravensberg" country (Westphalia), strongly Lutheran and soundly pietistic. The impressions then received have remained with him through life and they were by far the most potent he was ever to experience. How, then, could he agree with Barth that pious feelings had no place in the development of faith or that faith had nothing to do with experience?

In order to keep God in the transcendental sphere and the Word of God free from all subjectivity, Barth has gone to an intolerable extreme. He says, religion is always a movement of God towards man, never a movement of man towards God. We say, religion always starts in a movement of God towards man but it results, and always has resulted, in a movement of man towards God. The history of religion shows that man needs God and seeks him, but also that he has been unable to reach fulness of truth. Only when the Word was made flesh in Jesus Christ was God adequately revealed in his grace and truth. When the individual receives him by faith and surrenders to him, that is an action of the Holy Spirit but it is also a religious experience that may change a man's whole life.

Das Erbe der Reformation

Am Reformationstag erinnern wir uns der ſchöpferiſchen Zeit, die den Proteſtantismus ins Leben rief und prüfen uns wohl, ob wir noch auf den alten Grundfeſten ruhen, in der Schrift gelegt und von den Männern Gottes neu entdeckt. Aber dies Mal hat das Feſt für uns eine beſondre Bedeutung. Wir haben uns mit der Reformierten Kirche verbunden, und demnach hat ſich unſer

Gesichtskreis erweitert. Früher stand Luther, der große Bahnbrecher, der kerndeutsche Mann, im Mittelpunkt unsers Interesses. Kaum daß wir noch ein wenig übrig hatten für Melanchthon, seinen bescheidenen Mitarbeiter. Jetzt aber dehnt sich das Bild. Wir gedenken, daß Luther zwar der größte Reformator war, aber nicht der einzige. Was er für Deutschland tat, haben Zwingli und Kalvin für andre Länder getan. Nicht allein für die Schweiz, Frankreich und die Länder längs des Rheins. Durch John Knox, den Schüler Kalvins, kam der Kalvinismus nach Schottland, um später auch in Amerika eine herrschende Stellung einzunehmen.

Es ist zu beklagen, daß Lutheraner und Reformierte so bald sich entzweiten, daß sie die Unterschiede mehr betonten als das Gemeinsame. Im Zeitalter der Religionskriege haßten sie einander beinahe mehr als die Römischen. Die Lutheraner lernten früh, sich als die Vorkämpfer der **reinen Lehre** anzusehen. Schon im Reformationszeitalter bauten sie ihre theologischen Systeme aus und erreichten schließlich im Konkordienbuch die Vollendung ihrer Bemühungen um ein autoritatives Bekenntnis. In einem dicken Buch wurde ausgesprochen, was die Kirche glaube, und was der einzelne zu glauben habe. Wer von diesem Glauben abweiche, sei verdammt. Es liegt auf der Hand, daß eine solche Stellung notwendig zu einem Zeitalter der **Streittheologie** führen müsse und zum Hassen der Andersgläubigen.

Der Dreißigjährige Krieg, in dem die katholischen Mächte versuchten, den Protestantismus zu vernichten, lehrte schließlich alle Teile, daß man versuchen müsse, mit Andersgläubigen in Frieden zu leben. Es folgten Perioden des Pietismus, des Rationalismus („Aufklärung") und wieder ein Erwachen des Glaubenslebens als eine Folge der napoleonischen Kriege. Der preußische König Friedrich Wilhelm III., in wohlgemeintem Absolutismus führt die Union ein in seinen Landen, 1817. Er tat es als Summus Episcopus und konnte sich auf reformatorische Ideen berufen. Wir können ihn deswegen nicht verurteilen. Die Evangelische Synode hat sich stets als ein nach Amerika verpflanztes Reis des von dem König gepflegten Unionsbaumes angesehen. Sie hat den Unionssinn allzeit gepflegt und ist darin von den Lutheranern, insonderheit den Missouriern, von Anfang an bitter bekämpft worden. Diesen ist ja die Union ein Gewächs des Teufels und des sündigen Weltgeistes.

Aber in unserm Streben, die Evangelischen und Lutheraner zusammenzubringen, hatten wir bisher keinen Erfolg. Die Lutheraner wollten nicht, und die Reformierten kannten uns nicht. Bis daß die große Bewegung, die auf Kirchenvereinigung drängte, ins Leben kam. Nun hat die Generalsynode der Reformierten in Akron den Plan angenommen und dann hat unsre Generalkonferenz in Cincinnati dasselbe getan. Können wir nicht sagen: Das ist vom

Herrn geschehen und ist ein Wunder vor unsern Augen? Als Gleichberechtigte, als Brüder, als Jünger *eines* Meisters kommen wir in diesen Bund. Reformierte und Evangelische haben beide ihr Teil an dem Reformationserbe zu dem gemeinsamen Besitz hinzuzutragen.

Im Jahre 1909 feierten wir in Zanesville, Ohio, das hundertjährige Bestehen der ersten Presbyterianerkirche daselbst. Die andern Kirchen sprechen ihre Glückwünsche aus. Schreiber dieses sagte: Die Presbyterianer sind Kinder Kalvins. Als ich in Genf war, suchte ich das Grabmal Kalvins auf. Ich fand nur einen alten Stein, mit den beiden Initialen: J. C. Aber, sagte ich, Kalvin braucht kein Monument. Jede presbyterianische Kirche im Land ist ein Monument seines Lebenswerkes. Luther hat den Ton auf den Glauben gelegt, als das Mittel unsrer Rechtfertigung; Kalvin hat das auch getan, aber hat hinzugefügt die Betonung der Werke, als der Früchte des Glaubens.

Darob wurde ich von dem nächsten Redner, einem Lutheraner, heftig angegriffen. Er behauptete, Luther habe die guten Werke ebenso stark gefordert wie Kalvin. Dem mag so sein, aber jedenfalls seine Nachfolger in Deutschland und hier in Amerika haben die reine Lehre so einseitig auf den Schild erhoben, daß dem gegenüber alle andern Rücksichten in zweiter Linie kommen. Der Heidelberger Katechismus hat drei Teile: Von des Menschen Elend, von des Menschen Erlösung und von des Menschen Dankbarkeit. Der dritte Teil legt eine starke Betonung auf das christliche **Leben.** Der Christ soll, sagt er, seines Glaubens aus seinen Früchten gewiß sein. Ein ernstes, auch mißzuverstehendes Wort, aber im Einklang mit des Herrn Verlangen: „An ihren Früchten soll man sie erkennen."

Und es ist nicht nur das, was wir von den Reformierten lernen. Die Reformierten haben von Anfang an die **Rechte** der **christlichen Gemeinde** gewahrt. Ihnen verdanken wir die Gemeindeverfassung und die synodale Gliederung. Wir in Amerika werden uns dessen kaum bewußt. Der von Deutschland Kommende weiß, daß dort erst in den siebziger Jahren des letzten Jahrhunderts das Gemeinde- und Synodalsystem des reformierten Westens in den östlichen Provinzen eingeführt wurde.

Die Reformierten unsers Landes sind im ganzen starke Anhänger des **sozialen** Evangeliums. Die Lutheraner strenger Observanz haben noch kürzlich der Kirche allen Eingriff in soziale Gesetzgebung verboten und sie auf die Predigt des Evangeliums beschränkt. Wir werden fortfahren, soziale Ziele zu verfolgen, aber gut tun, nicht mit allen diesen Dingen **das Reich Gottes bauen** zu wollen.

Was die Theologie anbelangt, so halten beide Kirchen an dem Evangelium von Christo als dem Heiland der Welt fest. Wir werden beide unser Teil von Liberalismus oder Modernismus haben. Barth hat in der reformierten Kirche gute Aufnahme gefunden; wie es scheint, mehr als bei uns. Nun wir werden vielleicht noch mehr von ihm lernen. Im Uebrigen braucht man nicht alles zu schlucken, was uns die Schriftgelehrten alter und neuer Zeit vorsetzen. Noch vieles wäre zu sagen. Doch wir bescheiden uns mit dem, was gesagt ist. Mit Schiller wollen wir sagen:

Wir wollen sein ein einig Volk von Brüdern,
In keiner Not uns trennen und Gefahr!

Und den Herrn der Kirche bitten wir um seinen Segen und den Beistand seines Geistes.

Der deutsche Teil im nächsten Jahr

Wenn die Generalkonferenz sich auf unsre Seite stellt, so können wir für den deutschen Teil im nächsten Jahr folgende erfreuliche Mitteilung machen. Generalsuperintendent Dr. Dibelius wird zwei Artikel liefern und in denselben die kirchliche Lage in Deutschland und andern europäischen Ländern schildern, sowie auch über die theologische Situation in Deutschland berichten.

Er hat uns empfohlen, Professor Dr. Werdermann zu ersuchen, als unser Mitarbeiter einzutreten und die Stelle zu versehen, die Professor Dr. Grützmacher so lange zu allgemeiner Zufriedenheit inne hatte. Professor Werdermann ist augenblicklich Lehrer an der Pädagogischen Akademie in Dortmund. Er kennt Amerika, hat eine Zeitlang in unserm Predigerseminar gewirkt und weiß, was dem amerikanischen Pastor von Interesse ist.

Es gereicht uns zur großen Freude, diesen Plan den Lehrern bekannt zu geben. Professor Werdermann hat natürlich noch nicht Zeit gehabt zu antworten. Doch rechnen wir fest auf seine Zusage.

The Christian World

Friedrich Heiler's "Prayer"

By Lawrence Clare

Friedrich Heiler was born in 1892 near Augsburg, Germany, and was brought up a Roman Catholic. At the age of eighteen he came in touch with such men as Harnack, Wernle, and Deissmann among Protestants, and with Loisy and Tyrell among Catholic modernists. In 1919 he delivered a course of lectures in Sweden at the invitation of Archbishop Soederblom, and at the conclusion of his visit he received the Holy Communion according to the Evangelical rites. "By this act," he says, "without an open breach and without formal secession from the Roman Catholic Church, I entered the Evangelical Church fellowship." At the age of twenty-eight he was nominated professor of the History of Comparative Religions in the Evangelical Faculty of Thêology at Marburg. His literary works, though he is now scarcely forty, include books on Sadhu Sundar Singh, Buddhism, Luther, Jesus and Socialism, Evangelical Catholicity and St. Francis. His two most important works are "Prayer" (1918) and "Catholicism, Its Idea and Its Manifestations" (1923).

The following article is a discussion of his book on prayer, which has recently been translated into English by Dr. Samuel McComb and Dr. J. Edgar Park.

To Heiler prayer is the essential phenomenon of religion. The man who does not pray may be regarded as religiously dead, and the intensity of prayer, and its type, form the accurate test by which the degree of religion alive in men, or possible to them, may be measured. It is that by which we obtain power in religious living.

Heiler then turns to anthropology in order to study the prayer of primitive man. It is necessary for him to do this because throughout the book he is concerned to show the relationship between advanced forms of prayer and the instinct at work in earlier ones. He is not, however, very happy in his anthropological writing, which is perfunctory and lacking in all that vividness which we are accustomed to in the writings of Frazer and Marett. One is inclined to lay the book down at this stage; but most of us, I suppose, are in the habit of turning pages and glancing ahead, and those who do so are likely to persist, for chapter headings and summaries are alluring. The persistent reader will be amply rewarded.

Already, with an appreciation of the prayer of the Greeks, there is a heightening in style and interest. The Olympian religion is taken

as essentially Greek and is sympathetically analyzed. It is the religion of civilized men, many-sided in their interests, and deeply concerned with the maintenance of civilization. It is also the religion of free men, unspoiled by Semitic prostration before a Heavenly Sultan. In spite of Greek subtlety the type of prayer is naive, and in no wise neglectful of the good things of this world. Being closely associated with the State, the Olympian religion proved impermanent. The reader may be surprised at Heiler's statement to the effect that genuine Greek religion knows no mystical striving after a blessed union with God in ecstasy. What of the Mysteries? What of all that religion of Dionysos so brilliantly set before us in the "Bacchae" of Euripides? I suppose that we must lay the stress on the word "genuine" and take the view that these are Asiatic in origin. Nevertheless they were congenial to the Greek mind, and they did not die with the overthrow of Athens.

Having thus studied primitive prayer and civilized prayer such as still preserves its connection with the primitive, Heiler deals with the effects of philosophical criticism both upon what men think fit to pray for and upon the conception of God that they have in praying. Naive religion is anthropomorphic. Philosophy, on the other hand, concerns itself with the cold, impersonal, order of the universe and is critical even to the point of being contemptuous. If the philosopher is sympathetic enough to allow prayer at all, it is for the fulfillment of moral ideals; for acceptance of the order of the universe; for a noble freedom of personality; and not at all for the fulfillment of simple physical needs. Full rationalism, being abstract, dissolves prayer altogether, but only for the few, inasmuch as the many require something richer than rationalism can give.

Personal prayer at its best dispenses with sacrifice and becomes an intimate association with God. It is felt that it is God who inspires the prayer, that He is within it, immanent in the human nature from which it springs; and the idea of prayer and the idea of God exfoliate together. But though God inspires the prayer, it is for man to earn the inspiration. Such prayer tends away from earthly aims towards preoccupation with an intimate life with God.

Heiler then turns to a consideration of the two great religious types, the prophetic and the mystical. Several chapters are given up to this subject, and they are of extraordinary merit. (The English, though that of a translation, is smooth and pliable. It is a masterpiece of condensation.) He considers mysticism in its extreme form—that in which there is alleged to be such intercourse with God that human personality is dissolved, being absorbed in the infinite unity of the Godhead. It is useful to have this extreme form analyzed, as thereby we can detect certain weaknesses which may serve to remind us that mysticism is an element in normal religion and must not be driven too far so as to exclude other elements which have no less right than itself. A very pure form of mysticism is found in the Upanishads; in the great Greek writer Plotinus, to whom Dean William Ralph Inge has devoted two scholarly volumes; and in men like Eckhart. In the Upanishads the self of a man and the Self of the universe

are thought to be identical. To realize this is to attain salvation. When it is done the world falls away as though it was a dream. The One Self alone veritably *is*. This union, attained by flight from the world, is ecstasy. The great Self, so apprehended, is approached with shuddering and fascination—it is "numinous," to use the word coined for this specific purpose by Professor Rudolf Otto in his famous book "The Idea of the Holy." This self is God as known to the mystic, and the ecstasy referred to explains the frequent use of such terms as "fruition" or "enjoyment" of the Divine.

It is interesting to note that Heiler looks upon Buddhism as a thoroughly mystical religion. It differs from these others in a certain coldness in its apprehension of ultimate mystery. If ecstasy is the boiling point of religious experiene, Nirvana is its freezing point. Both, however, are sought as salvation. When we consider the mystical type of prayer we find that the course of such prayer suggests that it differs but little from the stages of *Jhana*, as described in Buddhist manuals.

> "Even Buddhist meditation is in its way an ascent to the *Summum bonum*, certainly not in a positive sense, not the vital turning to a Supreme Divine Reality, but in a negative sense, an emptying of self and a giving-up of self, that finds its culminating point in Nirvana. As Nirvana is nothing else than the *Summum bonum* of mysticism, only in its most negative form, the self-abnegation that aims at Nirvana is nothing but an ascent to the Highest and Last, as in a mystical prayer."

This passage is worth quoting because the point of view is unusual and exceedingly stimulating.

Contrasted with mysticism is prophetic religion. Here there is no thought of the great Self and one's identity with it, but, on the contrary, God is in Heaven and we upon Earth. It is fellowship with God, and not union, that is the end to be striven for. The remote, still unchangeableness, so loved by Plotinus and Eckhart, is supplanted by the God of burning energy, thought, will, and command. Prophetic religion, it is clear, is much nearer that of primitive man. It may be seen in almost perfect form in the Old Testament. Think first of the One of Plotinus and then afterwards of the Jehovah of the Old Testament, and at once one feels the difference between these contrasted types in all its force. Once this contrast is perceived it will be seen here, there, and everywhere. Thus the attitude towards history is, in mysticism, one of aloofness, so that men like Clement and Origen, though very great Christians indeed, are often accused of neglecting the Jesus of history in favor of the Eternal Christ of experience. In their approach to ethics the two types differ in a surprising way. To Prophetic Religion the moral imperative is an overwhelming claim of God upon the soul, and to neglect it is to be involved in sin, which is felt to be the supreme evil. The moral life is to be lived for its own sake and for the sake of the redeeming of the world; but mystical religion looks upon individual and social morality as a training of the

soul; as a means, indispensable it is true, of winning, free from entanglements that hamper one's approach, divine union. Moreover, mysticism is not characterized by a very strong social sense. A Tauler or an Eckhart feels kinship with a soul possessed of similar experience wherever it may be, but any evangelical passion for souls felt by these men is felt in spite of, not because of, their mystical approach. A further, but allied, difference is this, that Prophetic Religion is apt to be intolerant. There is one God and there is none other beside Him. All forms of religion divergent from itself are, in proportion to their divergence, evil. Only too readily does it, therefore, resort to the sword. But mystical religion knows no jealousy. It looks upon all other forms of religion as dim strivings in the direction of its own achievement, and very patiently it waits. For the same reason the mystic will usually attach himself to the religion of his time and place. There is little of the rebel about him, little of the reformer. He has eyes for resemblances and not for differences. Heiler is surely justified in attaching the importance that he does to this contrast. He says that they are "the two opposite tendencies of the higher piety which in history ever repel yet ever attract each other."

To these two types of religion correspond two types of prayer. Prophetic prayer is passionate, intensely ethical, and social. At all costs one must get rid of sin. The kingdom of God must be brought about by spiritual striving. God must be prevailed upon. His will must be moved. How different is this from the temper of the mystic, whose prayer is nine-tenths contemplation, and who by rejection of the world, and by spiritual training, seeks through well-recognized stages to approach divine union. Prayer of this latter type is, however, generally found combined with other elements that take away from its severity. Often it is attached to the idea of the Sacrament, and the reception of the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Mass has many parallels in more primitive religious experience. Another modification in the direction of warmth is to be found in the type of religion best represented by Saint Bernard. It is to him we owe the very curious interpretation of the Song of Solomon as being a description of the love of Christ for the soul, and the soul for Christ. Historically there is not a shadow of justification for this view, but psychologically it is of intense interest. It gave to Bernard a warm, passionate language for his mystical experience, and many have followed his example. Great dangers attend this form of expression, but it is capable of extreme beauty and dramatic effect. How startling, splendid, and dangerous it can be may be seen clearly in that curious masterpiece of medieval literature—"The Life of the Blessed Henry Suso." The modern mind is more sympathetic to the type of mysticism found in Wordsworth and Goethe. Here the world is not rejected. The One Reality lives within and through its Appearances, and to it one's heart goes out in gratitude and adoration; and through union with all life one attains peace and joy. Heiler, however, insists that we are not to confuse devotion and adoration with prayer. Devotion and

adoration may be impersonal, but prayer is a speaking and a being spoken to. It is the *inter*play of God and the soul. From this we judge that Heiler is more sympathetic to the prophetic form of prayer than to the mystical.

The book leaves us face to face with a problem. Two forms of religious experience, radically different from one another, exist. The one points to a God who is still, effortless, passionless, center of the Universe, towards which we are drawn as filings to a magnet. The other points to a God anthropomorphically conceived, closely related to the God of the primitives, who wills the coming of His Kingdom and claims us for His service. This stark contrast is a challenge to human thought. It is for us to refine upon each point of view and then seek some higher synthesis. Of such synthesis French Gothic architecture, so full of life and passion in its detail, and so still, awful, and transcendent in its total effect, is a suggestive symbol. A higher sythesis of these two types of religion would have behind it the weight of all our religious experience. This witness, which should be one, Heiler leaves divided against itself.—*Christian Leader.*

The Imperiled Heritage of the English Reformation

By John Clarence Petrie

The latest story I have heard illustrating the rapid adoption by Anglicans of Roman Catholic practices has for its setting a solemn function in the cathedral of one of the American cardinals. On this occasion it seems that a young thurifer who was a conscientious lad, trying his best to carry out his part in the church's ceremonies, met with an accident. At the close of a long procession the poor boy struck his censer against the gate of the altar rail and dumped the hot charcoal out onto the floor of the sanctuary. At once several acolytes leapt to his assistance and no harm was done. The unfortunate lad was deeply mortified for the rest of the service, for to add to his shame he had seen the eye of the cardinal upon him. Worse than that, as soon as the function was over the prelate summoned the boy to report to him in the vestry. Trembling in anticipation of a severe rebuke, containing perhaps with a sentence of suspension from his place as thurifer, he approached the dignitary.

"My boy," said his eminence in a not unkind voice, "what you have done is not in itself a serious offence. But it must not occur again; for if it did that young rector from St. Illumina's Episcopal church would think it a part of our ritual and begin having his thurifer dump the charcoal out on the sanctuary floor every Sunday morning."

That this story is not an outrageous libel on the Anglo-catholic movement all who have been close to that movement can vouch. Nor can there be any denying that the movement has now reached a stage where not only the letter but the very spirit of the reformation settlement is being violated by priests and bishops alike. Nor is the reason far to seek, for most Anglo-catholics are afflicted with an incurable inferiority complex: they are eternally afraid someone will think that

they are Protestants, that their priests will be mistaken for Protestant ministers, that their organization itself will be taken for a mere "sect" rather than for one of the three surviving "branches" of the Body of Christ, that their "mass" will be identified with the merely memorial Lord's supper of the Protestant sectaries. I have known clergy who so hated the word "Protestant Episcopal" that they would tear the title page from the pew copies of the book of common prayer lest their people be reminded of the "unfortunate nomenclature" wished upon their organization in the heretical days of its early independence in America.

The reformation in England, as all readers of church history know, was not intended to make a violent break with the past. Henry VIII was content to have part of the mass put into English, together with a simplification of services, the suppression of the religious orders and monasteries and whatever else strengthened the hands of Rome as against the crown. At his death more radical Protestantism came into power, with the revised services put out under Edward VI in the English tongue. Indeed the second prayer book of Edward was so distinctly Protestant in tone as to show a marked change in English worship and belief. But when the boy king died his work was undone by the return of England to Roman obedience under Mary the Catholic. At Mary's death Elizabeth chose to follow a moderate course and since her time England has remained outside the papal communion.

Middle of the Road Reformation

We may not like the middle of the road reformation that was followed pretty consistently by the makers of Anglicanism, but it was nevertheless a noble effort to preserve the essence of the old religion while removing the worst corruptions that had grown up around it in the centuries since Christ. For instance, the threefold ministry was not declared to be of divine necessity, but to have a history reaching back to the time of the apostles, and therefore worthy to be kept. As a matter of law and order in the church, none might exercise her ministry unless duly authorized by her. This gives forth no theory of the nature of holy orders. It offers nothing as to the validity of the Lutheran communion service. When Anglicans refuse to allow Presbyterian ministers to celebrate at their altars they do so in obedience to a rule of procedure in their church, not to a theory of orders.

The communion service itself was arranged so as to eliminate every item of the Roman Catholic sacrament cultus. Reservation was stopped, and when sick people wanted communion a service was provided for the patient's bedside. The presence of Christ in the act of eating the bread and drinking the wine was stated but left undefined, except that any magical change in the nature of the elements themselves was distinctly denied. The priest was ordered to break the bread so that the people might see and thus eliminate the magical features of the mass where, by whispering over the host, and by its elevation to the accompaniment of the bell, the people were taught to worship an ecclesiastical miracle.

Is it going too far to say that present day Anglo-catholic practice violates not only the letter but the spirit of the reformation in these matters? In regard to the ministry itself we find it stated in manuals published by high churchmen that Christ instituted a priesthood with a full monopoly over the sacraments. The test of being in the true church is possession by that church of the successors of the original priesthood. Presbyterians and Baptists and Methodists are not in that line and therefore their ministry is invalid—that is, their ministers cannot miraculously change bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. Furthermore in Anglo-catholic churches today the bread is not broken plainly before the people's eyes but every detail of the Roman priest's gestures is copied exactly.

Anglican Distinctiveness

That there is something distinctive about the Episcopal communion office is to my mind to be taken for granted. One may go to the lowest church where no sort of doctrine of objective presence is taught and yet find the whole service conducted in an atmosphere of the presence of God that is not to be duplicated by other Protestant services. It is this undefined faith in the presence of Christ in the communion that seems to me to have been in the mind of the Anglican reformers —namely the steering between the superstition of transubstantiation and the memorial meal of the non-conformist Lord's supper. If there is anything that most of our churches need it is just such a service. At an early hour of the morning one could approach the altar to meet God. There is no sermon, no instruction, no organ, choir, or congregational singing—just worship in quiet. Our whole nation needs quiet moments like these to offset the noise and strain of our life.

Anglicanism without an *ex opere operato* interpretation of her ministry and sacraments might so well be the gathering point for church union and the restoration of worship. But the Anglo-catholics will have none of it. They detest their own brother Anglicans who cherish such moderate views; they look upon all movements to make Anglicanism hospitable to the non-conformist churches as "Pan-Protestantism." Hence it is that the violation of the spirit of their reformation is no mere battle inside the Anglican body! it is something that affects us all.

The Sacrifice of Simplicity

Many years ago the Abbé Duchesne when in England used to visit the little chapel of the Anglican Cowley monks at Oxford. The simple twofold daily offices of morning and evening prayer delighted his heart, fed up as he was by the florid, intricate, unliterary, superstitious breviary of his own church. Many a priest of the Roman church has told me of his wish that Rome would put the breviary into English and shorten the office. So notorious is the set of lessons read at the second nocturn of matins that it is common for Catholic priests to say, "He lies like the second nocturn." Back in the sixteenth century the Anglican reformers rebelled against the breviary and determined to reform it. They cut the offices from seven to two, put them in English, abolished all lessons except those from the Bible, made the psalter

cover a month instead of a week, and arranged to have the entire Bible read through, the Old Testament once and the New Testament twice a year.

Today what do we see but those same Cowley monks whom Duchesne congratulated reading the breviary done into English! As for morning prayer, it is now shoved off to an hour when almost no one is in church and in its place is the mass. Furthermore at this eleven o'clock mass, instead of the congregation going up in a body to receive the communion as was the intention of the early church, they are told that it is a sin to communicate without fasting and they are discouraged from communicating late. In other words the intention of the reformers that non-communicating attendance at mass should be eliminated has been violated. Strangely enough the work of Pius X in trying to eliminate this same abuse from the Roman church seems to have gone for naught with the Anglo-catholics.

Intelligent Worship

But the worst feature of the Anglo-catholic revolt is their complete nullification of the noble effort made by the founders to restore the church to the people. Roman authorities are hopelessly handicapped in their own efforts in this direction. For the last quarter-century Roman Catholics have done everything possible to get their people to follow the services of the church intelligently. Missals and other books are translated into English, lecture courses on the mass are given, together with stereopticon slides illustrating the positions and movements of the priest throughout the service. But at best what can be done, with the service in Latin and so intricate that the truth of what the preface to the English prayer book says is most evident, that it took longer to look up the office than to say it when found?

At one swoop the Anglican reformers did this whole task magnificently. The offices of morning and evening prayer and the communion service can be followed by anyone who can read English. But the modern Anglican despisers of all things Protestant, disregarding the futile efforts of Rome, are going back to the old abuses. No one in the pews can today follow the Anglo-catholic priest at the altar if he depends upon the official service book of his church, the book of common prayer. The priest will be using an "American Missal" or an "S S P P Missal" (named for the Society of SS. Peter and Paul, an extreme organization in London), with collects, epistles, and gospels not in the prayer book lifted bodily from the Roman missal; with graduals, offertories, secreta and post-communion collects, special prefationes and what not, all from the Latin missal, and usually read by the priest under his breath, not infrequently in Latin! And this is disguised as the priest's "private devotions" or as "enriching the liturgy."

What Anglicanism Might Mean to America

It is to weep! Beautiful church, with your marvelous liturgy, your ancient tradition, your magnificent heritage paid for by the blood of your martyrs! What might you mean to a soul-starved America! What might you mean to church unity! And your sons show their

lack of confidence in you by borrowing the trappings of Rome! They show their lack of appreciation of your greatness by despising your dearly bought treasure!

Soul liberty, beauty of ritual, purity of doctrine, these have been the possession of the Anglican church; and these will be lost if her children go on despising this heritage. Perhaps when their liberty is gone, their magnificent prayer book superseded by the tinsel of the Roman missal, and their doctrine assimilated to the latest decree from the vatican, they will look back. And then the reformation will have to come all over again.—*The Christian Century.*

A New Approach to Channing

By Joseph Haroutunian

It is more than a hundred years since William Ellery Channing battled against the Calvinistic orthodoxy of New England, and emerged victorious. He did his work so well that when it was complete Calvinism was disgraced and was set aside by most of the progressive people "in and around Boston." The fundamental principles of Channing's faith have now become axioms of "liberal religion," and are accepted by all those who seek to interpret Christianity in the spirit of the modern world. Channing has proved to be the pioneer and prophet of "modern Christianity." He was the first great exponent of "ethical theism," which has now become the orthodox theology of the Christian religion.

"Ethical theism" gives us the clue to the religion of Channing. "Ethical" is the more distinctive word in this expression. It was Channing's ethical teaching that captured the hearts and minds of his audiences. He was a passionate preacher of righteousness and humaneness in social relations; he believed that it is the essential function of religion to promote the "good life." Therefore his impatience with Calvinism is easy to understand. This "system," with its doctrines of predestination and total depravity and substitutionary atonement, was a medieval superstition which discouraged reform and led men to despair of themselves. It was evident that the degrading estimate of human nature taught by the Calvinists was vicious and harmful. If men are to reform themselves and achieve goodness, they must have an exalted view of human nature and must believe that they are capable of godliness. They must be fully conscious of their innate ability to be righteous, of their responsibility as free moral agents to obey the moral precepts of Jesus, of their potential likeness to God. The obligation to achieve goodness presupposes a power, a nature, a will, which enables men to fulfill that obligation. The Calvinistic theology was completely unfitted to encourage men to such a view for their nature and their duties. Channing was profoundly convinced of this.

Channing's religious thought is a reflection of this temper of his mind. He conceived God as a Being of perfect goodness, a person, an intelligent moral agent. "We call God a Mind. God is another name for human intelligence raised above all error and imperfection, and

extended to all possible truth." He thought of Jesus as another person, the divine son of God, but second or inferior to God. The Holy Spirit was, to Channing, "a divine assistance adapted to our moral freedom." Sin or guilt was the wrongdoing of a moral agent. Thus, salvation was a good life on earth, to be followed with perfectly righteous and eternal existence in heaven.

This sketch of Channing's religion makes it evident that he had reinterpreted Christianity for the new and more humane age in which he lived. The nineteenth century was an age of humanitarianism, scientific progress, and moral and social reform. Men were learning to turn their eyes away from heaven and hell, and to apply themselves to the task of making this world a good place to live in. Channing had caught the spirit of the times. Setting aside the theology of a bygone age, he set forth and popularized a theology which was congenial to the mind of the time. This was a great service to Christianity. We accept it gratefully and remember it. But, looking at his work after a hundred years and considering its consequences, we wonder if his criticism of Calvinism was entirely just and altogether wise. The following, it is hoped, will not only contribute to historical justice but also suggest some necessary reconsiderations of basic problems which we have inherited from the past.

To begin with a practical question, How do men attain the good life? Is the sheer exercise of volition the only or even the important part of moral progress? It is one of the fundamental principles of modern education that a child does whatever interests it. Normally the will follows desire; a person chooses a course of action *because* of an end which he desires. That which a person desires is a good, an object of choice. Moral growth or the achievement of the good is an intellectual and emotional as well as a volitional process. When a person is not good or does not choose the good, it is not only his will, a bare act of volition, that is at fault, he does not desire and purpose the good. His temper or pattern of life is such that he does not seek the things of God. If he is to alter his way of life, he must undergo changes in his likes and dislikes, in his judgments as to what is good. He must acquire a new temper of mind and emotion. Channing's insistence upon the essential goodness of human nature, upon man's free will and moral agency, although strong correctives of a cynical Calvinism, were no solution to the moral problem. The theology which he opposed was in fact far more adequate in this respect than he suspected. The Calvinistic idea that man could not, as well as would not, live a Christlike life without the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit was based upon the simple truth that a Christlike life in earnest is possible only where there is a knowledge of and love or desire for it. In spite of their famous "determinism," the orthodox were no less aware of volition than their critics. But their realism did not permit them to believe that men did or could "freely choose" to be like Christ. It is not necessary to be extremely cynical to observe that mere volition has no tendency to produce either good or evil.

To be godlike, men must love and worship and desire God. They must have a "lively impression," as Edwards used to say, of the excellency and the glory of God. The God of Calvinism was the first and final Cause of all things, the perfection and infinitude of all virtue and power, the eternal Reality who was also the ideal. Calvinists like Joseph Bellamy mustered all their imagination and insight and eloquence to describe the perfect Good, God, and ended with the humble conviction that they were unequal to the task.

When they turned their minds to the Son of God, and tried to fathom the love and the wisdom of Christ, they were equally aware of their failure in speech and in deed. It seemed to them both reasonable and true that they were sinners. They recognized that a godly temper (for they did not expect perfect righteousness while in the body) came as a consquence of a full view of their sins, a repentant and humble view of their own lives, a clear vision of transcendent godliness as revealed by Jesus Christ, a profound change in their purposes and judgments of good. Thus the theocentric theology of Calvinism was an expression of a realistic conception of the chasm which separates the ideal from the real. In insisting upon the essential likeness of man to God, Channing darkened the Calvinistic vision of the transcendent ideal and encouraged the now prevalent illusion that we are as good folk as can be expected or desired. The complacent optimism, the stubborn unwillingness to face the evil in the world, the comfortable notion that all things are becoming quickly better, sentiments which have played havoc with our good sense and stood in the way of reform, are to be traced back to the romantic "faith in man" of which Channing was the first great apostle in America. A high opinion of man, instead of producing the moral progress anticipated by the nineteenth century, has led to pride and indolence, and given occasion to the new cynicism of those who find themselves forced to question the intelligence and good will of man. Faith in the future does not rest so much upon faith in man as upon faith in God. Those who lack such faith have to choose between despair and illusion. The strength of Calvinism rested in its firm faith in the power and benevolence of God and its realistic estimate of man.

Space does not permit us to point out how the famous doctrines of the Trinity, predestination, grace, the substitutionary atonement, etcetera, appear far more plausible in the light of the theocentric religion which they symbolize than is commonly recognized. We confine ourselves to the one issue of the foundations of godliness, a cause to which Channing was greatly devoted. We cannot evade the fact that Channing's exalted view of man has for many minds become a questionable idea. Therefore, there is legitimate place for the question, If we are to maintain a courageous and hopeful attitude toward the future, do we not need a revival of the elements of humility, receptivity, faith in the Eternal, which were predominant in Calvinism, which modern religion has minimized and confused because of its uncritical conception of real men as well as of "human nature?" We are grateful for Channing's work in discrediting whatever was unwholesome and un-

true in the Calvinism of his time. But the facts and needs of our day constrain us to the conviction that Channing's faith in man must be subsumed under the Christian faith in God.—*The Christian Leader.*

Spiritual Conversation

It is an astonishing fact that one of the criticisms that large numbers of young people bring against the Church today is the absence of what they call "spiritual conversation." They want to talk about religion, and they complain that their opportunities are too few or that they have no opportunities at all. Many young people assert that they attend conferences of various kinds, not for the sake of the general meetings and discussions but for the informal talks between two or tree which "happen naturally" at odd times. Leaders at conferences are amazed to observe the zest with which such talks are held.

Even more surprising are the statements made by young people regarding their lack in this matter at home. Everyone was shocked when the son of a bishop declared that he had never heard spiritual subjects so much as mentioned in his own home. His father and mother were deeply religious. "Yes, I know," the son said when this was brought forward; "but they never *said* anything about it." He wished something said about it; moreover, he desired to talk about religion himself. A girl whose mother was one of the most convincing speakers on missions in the Church insisted that she had never heard her mother say a single word on the importance of Christianity *except* in a speech in public. The girl longed to talk about it in "ordinary conversation." The children of many rectors have said that they knew what their fathers thought about religion *only* from their Sunday sermons.

In these days of free speech, particularly among young people, we may well wonder why these boys and girls did not begin the conversations in which they so wished to engage. Yet we are aware that even persons who are shy in no other way are often extremely shy in respect to "spiritual conversation." And, of course, it is well known that it is frequently easier to talk about religion with a stranger than with a member of the family, particularly when a beginning must be made. Thus we meet the sons and daughters of decidedly religious families, and they startle us by saying that "spiritual conversation" is a new experience to them.

Why have the parents kept silence? This question is often asked and an answer demanded. It is not so very difficult to understand the silence of many fathers and mothers. They grew up in the traditional reserve of their generation concerning things. There were no conferences, no discussion groups in their parishes or dioceses. In preparation for Confirmation, they attended "Confirmation classes," read the books designated by their rectors, and "thought"—as one of them recently said. No one spoke to them *personally* about spiritual things, not even about the approaching First Communion. They were not troubled by any feeling of something lacking. Not at all: they know that what they were about to do was supremely important. They

knew that it was so regarded by their parents and rectors and godparents—though not one of them "*said* anything." It was not the custom to talk about spiritual experiences.

Now it *is* the custom. Indeed, it is the custom to talk about anything in which one is vitally interested. The young people want to talk about religion. Perhaps their parents are aware of this, but find it almost impossible to begin. How about their rectors? Here is another question requiring an answer. For some of the rectors are only a few years older than their young parishioners. Of course, many of them do speak personally of spiritual things to the young people; but by no means all.

One reason is to be found in that very desire to make friends with the young people, urged upon every pastor today. The fear that anything "clerical" will hinder or entirely prevent this has led to numerous practices, intended to make the "approach" easy. For example, some young pastors do not wear clericals. Tweed or dark blue serge, they honestly think, will facilitate their acquaintance with young people—especially if a red tie is added. Another thing they do is to use to the full any skill they may have in sports. But a really serious practice is the care they take to refrain from all mention of religion, except in church, or in reply to questions, lest they "alienate" the young people. Young though they are, some of the young clergy have actually not discovered that their lay contemporaries are eager for spiritual conversation.

Occasionally, this is strikingly revealed at a conference. For instance, at one conference for young people, the chaplain was a splendid young clergyman, a genuinely and deeply religious man. He was good at sports of all the available kinds, both land and water. The young people crowded around him; they appeared to be delighted with him. "He is marvelous," they said; "and not a bit like a parson." But the significant point is that, later, when they were asked to evaluate the conference and to make suggestions for improvements to be carried out the next year, they wrote: "There was little if any talk about religion, except in chapel. Most of us would like to have it come in at other times, sort of casually." This recommendation was made the subject of a post-conference discussion. The young chaplain said publicly that he had *wanted* to talk about religion, that it really was the great interest of his life; but he had thought it right to wait for some one else to begin. Whereupon, various members of the conference said that they *wanted* to begin; but felt that he was not "expecting" it. He admitted that perhaps he wasn't, but that he certainly would be, next time.

It is not easy to begin talking about religion if silence and reserve have been the custom. Moreover, there are some devout men and women, young as well as old, who would never be willing to talk about spiritual things informally or under ordinary circumstances. They feel about holy things as they do about holy places; they could never treat either "sort of casually." Perhaps such persons would never be

able to talk about spiritual things even with their nearest and dearest, except on some extraordinary occasion. What they can do is to try to provide opportunities for spiritual conversation for their children, if they are parents; for their associates, if they are young people. Most of them do this. Religion is profoundly important to them.

Many other Christian people to whom it is equally important *could* talk about it, if they would. Perhaps they do not particularly wish to do it; or it may be that they are as shy as the young people about beginning. The great thing to remember is that the young people want spiritual conversation; they feel the need of it. Anyone who helps them to it, "sort of casually," is doing a real service to youth.

—*The Living Church.*

Future of Preaching

"Preaching is doomed," cried a preacher last week at the Northern Baptist Convention in Washington. He was Dr. Bernard Chancellor Clausen, slight, blond, emphatic pastor of Syracuse, N. Y.'s First Baptist Church, a onetime Navy chaplain and communications officer on the U. S. cruiser *North Carolina.* Dr. Clausen began broadcasting sermons in 1920. He now speaks eight or ten sentences to "appropriate" music in a morning radio service, conducts a Saturday night radio Bible class with dramatized Bible stories. Last February Dr. Clausen spoke by air to the "largest audience of Baptists ever assembled," his listeners tuning in at their churches. Of the future of preaching he said last week: "We little, unimportant preachers may retire from the field with disgruntled resentment, or we may be a part of a joyous acceptance of this new tool which science has placed in our hands for the winning of the world."

Dr. Clausen did not tell the Northern Baptists about the "new tool" but he explained later to newsmen that he meant television—possible in ten years. Then, he thinks, half a dozen preachers will serve the whole world. Churches will so time their services that they can tune in on studio sermons. This will not throw little, unimportant preachers out of jobs. They will become executives, helping their parishioners to understand and live by the televised messages.

Besides hearing Dr. Clausen the Northern Baptists:

¶ Refrained, after brisk debate, from withdrawing from the Federal Council, and from repudiating the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry which was financed by Baptist John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

¶ Came out for peace and disarmament, flayed Repeal and sweatshops.

¶ Elected as president Dr. William Shattuck Abernethy of Washington's Calvary Baptist Church.

¶ Met with the Southern Baptists for the first time since Slavery divided them. Retiring President Charles Oscar Johnson of the Northern Baptists and Dr. Monroe Elmon Dodd of the Southern Baptists visited President Roosevelt. Said they: "Mr. President, we are back of you 96.8%. We can't go the 3.2%."—*Time.*

"Back to Luther!"

Every summer U. S. Lutherans hold a "Luther Day" picked arbitrarily so that Lutherans may enjoy it in the mountains or at the seashore. Last week came a Luther Day which was notable because it preluded bigger celebrations, to be held Nov. 10 on the 450th anniversary of Martin Luther's birth. Eastern Lutherans, gathered at Ocean Grove, a strict Methodist colony on the New Jersey coast, had the most eminent speaker—Dr. Walter Arthur Maier, editor of the *Walther League Messenger* (for the young), professor at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis.

Cried Dr. Maier: "Without Luther there could have been no Washington. . . . While [Lincoln] dealt with bodies in bondage and minds coerced by mental slavery, Luther threw off the shackles of that damnable spiritual tyranny that pressed human souls of all colors and races into the strait jacket of abject terror that cringes before the distressing spectres of an outraged conscience and shudders before the thought of God and eternity. . . . All Protestantism, yea, Roman Catholicism itself, as its eminent scholars have admitted, not only owes him an everlasting debt of gratitude but also needs the re-statement of many of his principles. . . . If, as the world pauses to celebrate his birth four and a half centuries ago, it would rear a shaft of reverent devotion to his living memory, although that monument might be built from flawless granite, faced with stainless alabaster, edged with the rarest of marbles and raised to the loftiest heights to which human skill can ever ascend, this monument would be incomplete unless, in recognition of Luther's present day significance, there were emblazoned on its side in letters of imperishable gold, the challenge of this birthday anniversary, 'BACK TO LUTHER!'

"Surveying the rampage of crime, the increase of atheism, the stolid indifference toward the stern requirements of purity and chastity, we insist 'BACK TO LUTHER.' And if this challenge means wide and repeated protests against the bribery and corruption of officials in the various departments of American administrative government; if it involves organized protests against the levities and discrimination of American courts, stick-to-the-finish campaigns against the debasing and enervating influences of commercial amusements as they are controlled by greedy, soul-less men, may God give us the courage and insistence to declare with undenable finality, 'BACK TO LUTHER.'

". . . Picture the cancerous growth of modern infidelity as ego-complexed pulpiteers, disguising the breed of the wolf beneath silk cassocks and lacy chasubles, masquerade in imposing processions within high vaulted Gothic cathedrals, built with the superfluous millions of American plutocrats. . . . Think of the brilliant agnostics who read from the Scriptures with crossed thumbs, tongues in the cheek, and mental reservations, who place the Bible on the level with heathen philosophies. . . . Think of the smooth, oily surrender of the deity of our Savior . . . I still repeat the cry, 'BACK TO LUTHER.'"

—*Time.*

Pacifists 39%

When the Oxford Union startled England by voting not to bear arms "for King or country" (TIME, Feb. 27 *et seq.*), echoes were soon heard in U. S. universities. A nation-wide poll on arms-bearing was undertaken by the Student Federation of America, the Brown University *Daily Herald* which had editorially denounced war (TIME, April 3), and the Intercollegiate Disarmament Council, whose President James Frederick Green, Yaleman, was permitted to sit in on the Geneva Conference during its siesta last year. Last week the U. S. vote was published. In 27 States, at 70 colleges, 22,627 students* voted as follows: for downright pacifism, 8,938 or 39%; for bearing arms only in case of invasion, 7,342 or 33%; for bearing arms in any U. S. war, 6,347 or 28%. Most wholeheartedly pacifist were 13 women's colleges (49% against, 23% semi, 28% for) and ten State colleges (42% against, 37% semi, 21% for). Least pacific were 23 universities (37% against, 33% semi, 30% for).

Brown University's pacifism excited an investigation by the Rhode Island Legislature. Voting in the poll was forbidden at the University of Nebraska, Hartwick College (Oneonta, N. Y.) and the College of the City of New York. Because the last is a taxpayers' institution, any "Red" result would have been " extremely impolitic." C. C. N. Y. has enough troubles anyway. Last week a C. C. N. Y. student named Jacob Itzkowitz appeared before a Brooklyn justice named Charles E. Russell. He wishes to reassume the name Bakur which his grandfather had given up to avoid military service.† Justice Russell sternly denied Jacob Itzkowitz's application, launched a brisk denunciation of C. C. N. Y. as a place where the taxpayers, "the orderly and decent element, are educating a bunch of young Communists and Socialists." At once C. C. N. Y.'s president, alumni and friends burst into print, flaying Justice Russell for an impertinent flouter. Later a Supreme Court Justice granted the name-change, rebuked Justice Russell. Justice Russell, rebuked, said that investigation had convinced him C. C. N. Y.'s "bunch" was "but a minority," thanked C. C. N. Y.'s faculty for "the temperate manner in which the facts have been brought before me."

That afternoon C. C. N. Y.'s President Frederick Bertrand Robinson, 49, walked across the street to Lewisohn Stadium to review a drill of the college's Reserve Officers' Training Corps. When he reached the entrance with his military science department head, Colonel George Chase Lewis, and other guests, he found a Pacifist crowd blocking his way. They jostled him, pinioned his arms for a moment. Then he raised his umbrella, flayed left and right, soon lost his umbrella. Police drove a flying wedge into the mob, surrounded President Robinson and convoyed him into the Stadium. Said he, "They were probably Communists from outside. . . . The demonstration [was] aimed particularly at Colonel Lewis." At the review inside the Stadium, the R. O. T. C. band played on against the chanting outside: "War is hell." "Down with war."

---

* There are some 750,000 college and university students in the U. S.

† In Russia, exemption was granted to one son of an aged father. There were three brothers Bakur, all wanting exemption. Two of them changed their names, pretended they had fathers named Kocher and Itzkowitz.

Book Review

NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*
(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)

Jesus after Nineteen Centuries, by *Ernest Fremont Tittle.* The Abingdon Press, 1932. 217 pages.

In these Lyman Beecher Foundation Lectures delivered at Yale University, the gifted pastor of the Evanston Methodist Church really seeks an answer to the question, is Christianity practicable today? Can Jesus who lived in the first century be our guide in the problems of our complicated modern life? This is doubtless no new question, but it is the main question that Christianity is grappling with at this time and there are enough who consider it foolish to try to apply the principles of Jesus to conditions so wholly different from those of a time gone long since. We remember the book written by Miss Austin some years ago, where she attributed to Jesus the mentality of a "small-town man" with the obvious limitations resulting therefrom. Professor Barnes was even more radical. He judged that any liberal professor of theology, endowed with a little knowledge of sociology and economics, would be a better adviser on the questions of the day than Jesus. To him Jesus was a very good man whose memory ought to be honored by instituting a "Be kind" day, but to take him seriously in this matter of fact world would be futile.

Others, who by no means approve of the iconoclasm of a Barnes, still point out that Jesus was an eschatologist. He believed in the speedy end of the world. His ethical ideas were adapted to the short period that might intervene before the cataclysm; they could in no way be applied to a world view that reckons with many centuries of development.

The author, on the other hand, gives to Jesus the place of undisputed leadership in the church and the world of the twentieth century. Jesus had limitations and illusions, but in spite of these, history has vindicated his prophetic authority. We have evolved a civilization and an industrial efficiency Jesus knew nothing of; but the spirit of Jesus must still tell us how to live securely, nobly and happily.

From him we learn the large loyalty. To him the family was God's chief agency for training the individual. But his whole life was an illustration that the entire race was the object of God's fatherly love. In following the footsteps of Jesus we are slowly learning that the interests of the group, the nation, the world are to be subordinated to that larger loyalty which is due to the coming Kingdom of God. "Jesus called the nation to repentance, not to arms. He labored to inspire it with the dream of world service. His life was absolutely con-

trolled by the faith that love is the only redemption of the world." How to overcome evil; the necessity of the cross, i. e. of pain, sacrifice and heroism in fighting for a good cause; the getting rid of fear by faith in God, and how man's hunger for life may be satisfied by seeking the "Kingdom of God," are questions treated in able chapters.

To many of us the first question to be answered in a book with the title chosen by the author, would be, is Jesus still the Savior, the one who unites us with God and enables us to lay hold of "salvation"? No doubt Tittle would consider that also fundamental. However, here the ethical out-working of the Christian faith, the question, can we believe that in the spirit of Christ all problems pressing on the race could be solved, is the predominant issue. On these matters the book offers valuable light. That "in him lay life and that this life was the light for men," is its chief text. It's the usual way to move from the love of God experienced by us to the love of man as its fruit. The author pursues the opposite course. "Worship without God," he says, "is futile. Only in case we deal justly and kindly one with another and strive ever to make justice and good will rule in our society shall we come to believe that God is love."

What's Life All About? A key for those who ask the question by *Bertha Condé* (author of "The Human Element in the Making of a Christian," "A Way to Peace, Health and Power"). Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1930, 271 pages.

In this book the author attempts an apologetic for the Christian faith. The achievements of science are so great, so useful and so convincing that many look down with a sneer upon any other approach to reality. At the same time all the victories of science cannot conceal from us the fact that in the ordering of human life and in the coordination of society's conflicting interests we have made a dismal failure. The writer aims to show that without the religion of Jesus Christ we shall never solve our task, and that we are perfectly able to prove the validity of our Christian faith by scientific principles. She may at times overstate her case a little along these lines, still in the main she contends for the reasonableness of the Christian attitude with great persuasiveness. She says, "all idealism of Christian systems may lure us by its beauty but we demand more. Our subjective visions must become objective realities in life. Visions are illusions and not inspirations unless they work in real life. Thought must be tested by its observed consequences, by those highest laws which underly the universe."

On the essentials of the Christian faith the writer strikes no uncertain note. Wieman, the psychologist, may be right, she says, in defining worship thus: "It is the opening of mind or spirit toward the beneficient aspect of the Universe, which some of us call God." This is good as far as it goes, she continues, but it does not go far enough. An "aspect" is impersonal. I am personal, with a capacity for love which can only be satisfied by the response of personal love. An im-

personal relationship is like intercession to the Sphinx. Our conception of God's personality may be anthropomorphic. Still, if God is more than personal, he is certainly not less.

Later, in the chapter on Prayer, she refers to the attempts of W. James and others to explain its function by calling into play the "subconscious," the reservoir where the experience of the race is stored up and breaks at times through the thin wall into consciousness in inspirations and insights that seem to come from outside or above us. This, says James, is called by some the absolute spirit, with which we coalesce to a certain extent; others call it God. The author doesn't leave us in the dark here. She knows the psychological influence of prayer in giving poise, peace, confidence is great, but she firmly asserts the fact of God's real intercourse with the praying Christian. If the praying man came to believe that prayer was only a communing with his own deeper self it would not survive very long.

Jesus the author calls the greatest fact in human experience. She knows she has a good case in dwelling on his uniqueness. Even the Hindu scholars grant that there is "no one else seriously bidding for the heart of man" except Jesus Christ. She quotes a surprisingly full and harmonious chorus of witnesses as to the supreme place of Jesus in the past as well as in the living present. She knows that praising him, writing about him in itself cannot do much more than preparing the ground. The real knowledge of Jesus comes only as a product of the Spirit's action in a change of heart and life.

The book is a very strong and warm "apologia" for the faith in God revealed in Jesus Christ. Her own argument is corroborated by a veritable host of advocates of old and modern times, which a wide reading of the pertinent literature enabled her to quote. The volume has already appealed to a large number of readers; we add our own commendation: may the author continue to please, strengthen and comfort many who look for guidance and uplift in this time of confusion and distress.

Religion in Life Adjustments, by *Samuel Nowell Stevens,* Northwestern University. The Abingdon Press, New York, 1930. 147 pages.

That the affairs of the churches and religion are in a state of crisis no one, the writer says, can deny. The Modernists cry, "The way of life is the new way of science and social service; religion taking any other way must die". "The way of life", Fundamentalists shout, "is the old way of creeds and personal conversion; religion taking any other way gives up the ghost". The author himself admits that there is crisis and conflict in the religious world, but he contends that this is only natural. Religion must learn to adjust itself to the changes that life inevitably brings about. Such a process involves strife, but the result will be wholesome.

He examines the case of religion from the viewpoint of psychology, asking the question, what can it do towards integration of personality,

ethical demands and the shifting situations of life? and finds that its resources, if well tapped, are found to be adequate to a surprising degree.

His argument runs chiefly in the direction of idealism. Religion furnishes us with spiritual values, or ideals. Science gives us the facts, religion helps us to find the spiritual interpretation. It aids us to see life whole. What seems hard, unbearable, when looked at by itself, assumes a different aspect when placed in the larger perspective . Man is apt to be interested in things, he is absorbed in acquisitive pursuits. Religion puts the emphasis on life and the way it is lived. The end of life can only be the developing of a well balanced personality, whose relations to others are actuated by love. Faith in God helps us to find such balance. Jesus is the great exemplar of such, an all around character, in right relations to God and his fellow-men. He was perhaps the most normal man that ever lived (notice the "perhaps"). As he relied on and practiced prayer so we ought to be men of prayer. The writer puts the stress on prayer as a mental discipline. His way of explaining the effect of prayer reminds us of what Moody used to say of similar attempts: "Keep on praying, there is no real answer but it is healthy exercise".

The author doesn't think much of creeds and theological formula, but we must insist that the Scriptures do not present Jesus as an inspiring teacher and example only but as a Savior. God is not the "homeland of spiritual values" only, but a Father who establishes personal relation with us in Jesus. The writer quotes Eustace Haydon approvingly, who explains religion as the "shared quest of the good life" and leaves God out. He ventures the statement that with the help of modern knowledge we could learn to know human nature better than Jesus himself. Also that supernatural power is not necessarily involved in the successful living of a complete life. In speaking of Jesus at the grave of Lazarus he says, "Jesus brought calm and purpose as well as joy back into the lives of those who were bereaved by turning their attention and their enthusiasm toward the living of life itself" (but according to John, Jesus brought Lazarus back to life, too).

The author brings a great many "case studies" as illustrations of the integrating power of religion. They are very interesting, showing the remarkable psychological effect of a right religious attitude on the physical and moral health of seriously disturbed natures.

The following concluding sentences reveal the writer's position and outlook: "The older passion to save men's souls has gone long since, because the old convictions about some future life have disappeared. Still the minister as a pastor may come to the aid of men and women who are in the process of becoming souls. Let the minister approach this great task with new tools and modern understanding and the dynamic power of an earlier day will be regained. Lives will be made over for happiness and finer living, here and now".

Swastika. The Nazi Terror, by *James Waterman Wise.* New York, 1933, Harrison Smith & Robert Haas. 128 pages.

This book makes unpleasant reading. It is an interpretation and, coming from a Jew, of course a condemnation of the anti-Semitism of the Nazi government of Germany. What it says about the extent of the sufferings of the Jews in the Reich, may be exaggerated, but there can be no doubt as to the disastrous consequences of a policy that treats the Jew as an alien and curtails his rights of citizenship. There is good reason for the Jewry of the world engaging in a campaign of economic relief for their brethren in Germany. The author attributes the success of Hitler's agitation against the Jew to various causes. The chief one, he says, is the general despair brought about by the loss of the war and the treaty of Versailles. The Germans could not resign themselves to their terrible fate and looked for something or somebody to blame for it. They decided on the Jew. The Jew had never been popular, there had often been anti-Semitic groups and movements. The Jews had been prominent in the radical parties that took the lead in the revolution of 1918. With surprising rapidity Hitler succeeded in convincing a worn and mentally unbalanced people that the Jew was the cause of all his troubles. Another reason he finds in the fact that not only in Germany but all over the world the ideals of the nineteenth century, such as freedom, individualism, tolerance, democracy are on the decline. The weakness of democracy have been exposed pitilessly and there has been a general turn towards fascism and dictatorship. The Jews who were some of the main exponents of the old liberalism now come to feel that the trend of the times is against them.

Reviewer has no hesitation in saying that to him the anti-Jewish policy of the German government seemed a great mistake. It was hard to believe that the Germany of Lessing would be ready to adopt the policies of Czarist Russia. It was still more surprising that at this late date Christian people would approve disfranchising fellow-nationals simply because they were Israelites.

And as sincere friends of our old fatherland we saw with dismay that the anti-Jewish attitude of the government would alienate the minds of countless people in foreign lands. We all remember the meetings sponsored by Jews but participated in by Christians, where American public opinion was aroused to flaming protests against Hitler and what he stood for. Ominous words were heard in England from influential persons saying that the friendship for Germany that had developed since the War was being lost through recent developments and that English sympathies now lay more with France than with Germany. We read such statements with a sinking of the heart for we knew that Germany could ill afford to lose the good will of other nations. There is little hope that the present course will soon be changed in Germany, but doubtless the government will try to smooth over the hardness that its program causes to the unfortunate members of the Jewish race.

To an outsider it would seem that anti-Semitism is the one great initial mistake of the present regime. The insistence on purity of race,

on Aryan blood is an essential part of their platform. To us it is a far-fetched, narrow and artificial ideal. However, all that we hear from our friends in the "old country" is a paean of praise on the unification of the German people. The only place where they withhold judgment but show misgivings is the government's stand in church matters. We find it harder to join this chorus of jubilation. Still, we must admit that all this enthusiasm cannot be self-induced. There must be some substantial gain. As one says, "Whatever one thinks of the permanence of this spirit one has to admit that a new will to discipline, a new collective devotion has come which is dissolving all opposition. Hitler has been able to do something that even Bismarck did not do" (Humrighausen in "Christian Century"). May we become more and more certain of the real "rebirth" of old Germany.

The Meaning of Life, by *Will Durant.* Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, Inc. New York, 1933, 144 pages.

Will Durant, the great popularizer of philosophy, discusses here the most fundamental and essential of all questions with which philosophy has grappled, Is there any meaning to life? Can it be discovered, and if so, is there enough certainty and sufficient satisfaction in it to make life worth living? We live in an era of confusion, the old certainties and sanctions are gone, is there enough left to furnish inspiration for moral striving and for the pursuit of happiness? Our forefathers believed in God, the friend of man; in Jesus Christ, the head of a new race, the giver of life abundant and the guarantor of immortality. But now "astronomers have told us that human affairs constitute but a moment in the trajectory of a star; geologists have told us that civilization is but a precarious interlude between ice ages; biologists have told us that life is war, a struggle for existence among individuals, groups, nations, alliances and species. Historians have told us that progress is a delusion, whose glory ends in inevitable decay; psychologists have told us that the will and the self are the helpless instruments of heredity and environment and that the once incorruptible soul is but a transient incandescent of the brain." Many other developments have been injurious to the joys of home, to the happiness of the submerged masses. Religion that was once the strength of the tempted and the source of peace to the discouraged and unfortunate, has gone from the hearts of millions. It has been reduced to the rank of wishful thinking and the Christian "epic" as depicted in the scriptures has taken its place with the mythologies of other religions.

In this book the author gives us little of his own personal creed. He has written letters to a great many outstanding men and women, asking for their own views on the meaning of life and their replies constitute the bulk of his little volume. Dreiser, Mencken, Sinclair Lewis, take the position of materialism. They have no use for God, for the Christian faith, for the hereafter. They find satisfaction in the work they are doing, in following the urge to create, that is in them,

to depict life as they see it. There are a great many others, not so well known, who contribute to this symposium. John Erskine, John Cowper Powis, Havelock Ellis, even Will Rogers; Carl Laemmle, the producer; Adolph S. Ochs, owner of the New York Times; Gandhi; John Haynes Holmes; Mary Woolley; and last (and least) Mrs. Helen Wills Moody, the tennis player (who modestly says herself that she was the only one who got on the list through brawn and not brain).

As a rule their replies stress the fact that to them life is worth living because they find satisfaction in work ("creative" work some call it, e. g. Mr. Laemmle). We haven't found any deep philosophy or particularly striking sayings in this anthology. Some rudely reject Mr. Durant's invitation, so e. g. Count Keyserling who says "when stating his ideas he prefers using his own setting to providing material for the book of another." George B. Shaw says, on a postal card: "How the devil do I know? Has the question itself any meaning?"

Mr. Durant's own contribution to the problem he raises is far from satisfactory. He has given up the (Catholic) faith of his youth and misses the consolation he used to find in it. He doesn't consider individual immortality very likely. He finds joy in life as a father and husband and because his work is congenial. There are millions, he knows, the nature of whose work is a burden to them rather than a self-expression. Still, if they will, they'll find much joy in nature's beauty. If they can't find a place in the industrial work let them go to the country (very helpful advice, indeed).

The deepest and noblest definition of satisfactory human life has been given by Jesus Christ while he was about to lay down his own: "This is the life eternal that they know thee the true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Any other definition that omits the religious need will be found disappointing in the long run.

Have We Outgrown Religion? by *Charles Reynolds Brown*, Dean Emeritus of the Divinity School, Yale University. Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York and London, 1932. 198 pages.

In his well known manner—clear, reasonable, persuasive—the former dean of the Yale Divinity School maintains the cause of religion before "the cultured among its despisers," to use Schleiermacher's phrase. As it was a man of a disordered mind who in the gospel narrative rudely exclaims, "What have I to do with Jesus?" so it may be said today that the opponents of religion don't know what the real needs of the human race are. They call the faith in God a defence mechanism whereby man tries to get over the unpleasant things of life. Science, they think, has displaced religion for the modern man. But nevertheless millions hail Jesus as their King, although he is poor and weak and we are living in this land of wealth and power. We are proud of our fighting forces and yet the number of those is growing steadily who believes Jesus was right when he said that they that draw the sword will perish by it. The test of whether religion has lost its old time place of honor can only be that of experience.

We can still say there is no one to compare with Jesus in the religions of mankind. The idea of religion became alive in Jesus Christ and in him life abundant becomes available for all who find life inadequate without the divine presence.

We all have to make adjustments in our religious conceptions as we grow older and assimilate the knowledge of our age. The man of sense finally emerges from that period of discrimination and readjustment with a more valid and more rewarding faith. An honest religious faith, grounded in reason, vitalized by personal experience and made real by being related to everyday duty, is the best sort of preparation for the life that now is and it furnishes the only adequate preparation for that which is to come.

The dean is thoroughly at home as he discusses these weighty questions before his audience of college pupils. He speaks their language, draws freely on his rich store of illustrations, quotes liberally from those who speak impressively to their times. He will be listened to with profit also by men of maturer age for there are few who in sympathetic understanding of the difficulties of the day and in solid faith in the essentials of the Christian message are superior to him.

The book makes no attempt to prove that the various doctrines of the church are securely buttressed. It takes the practical course in pointing out that the needs and requirements of human life are so deep and compelling that only a religious attitude has any chance of meeting them. The greatest danger of this modern age is externalism (J. Dewey) and "the true office of education is to distribute the bread of life and to breed an appetite for it", J. R. Lowell. Religion in the twentieth as in any other century, is not an elective, it is and will be a required course.

Christianity and Philosophy, by *D. Miall Edwards*, Professor of Philosophy of Religion and Systematic Theology at the Memorial College, Brecon, Wales. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1932. 327 pages.

Religion and Philosophy are two activities of the human mind which are bound to react upon each other. They cannot be kept apart as it were in hermetically sealed compartments of the mind. Both of them attempt in different ways to apprehend the ultimate nature and meaning of the universe and to solve the problem of life. Philosophy seeks to discover this meaning by the use of logical thought and religion by means of faith. The latter claims to reach into depths closed to the former; still, if they both use their methods legitimately, they ought to yield results that are not contradictory. Religion's discoveries may be beyond the reach of reason, but they could hardly be against reason. We do not, with the later schoolmen, hold anymore that what is true in philosophy is false in religion, and vice versa.

In past periods of the world's history a synthesis has sometimes been found between philosophy and religion. In the patristic period Christian teachers looked to Plato as the one to support faith with philosophical conceptions, and in the middle ages Aristotle was en-

throned in the mind of the Church as the supreme master of systematic thought. Such a synthesis is not to be expected at this time. The immense influence of science has concentrated the attention on the objective world and its laws and has relegated for the majority the world of the spirit to the background. Nevertheless, for purposes of self-defence, propaganda and clear understanding we are bound to use the weapon of philosophy. We know very well that the object of faith cannot be demonstrated by the use of logical arguments. However, philosophy can be used to show the reasonableness of religion. Philosophy if it wants to be fair is compelled to consider all kinds of experience in its judgment on ultimate reality and the meaning of life. It is therefore only impartial justice to include spiritual experience in the search for full-orbed truth.

Religious experience, the author goes on to say, is the apprehension of the Supreme Reality under the form of worship (etymologically: worth-ship) or *value*. The philosophical idea of "value" has become fundamental in recent thought. That is said to have value, he explains, which is capable of satisfying some desire of our nature. Value is not a purely objective property of the thing itself. It has reference to a mind capable of appreciating or enjoying the object and thus standing in contrast to bare fact. It does not mean that values are purely subjective or wholly independent of objective facts. But, psychologically, there is an important difference between the mental attitude of description and that of appreciation, between explanation and valuation. "Religion is then the apprehension of the divine sub specie valoris." Religion has been explained as tantamount to morality, or to knowledge (Hegel) or to art. The reason for such a diversity of interpretation is the fact that every one of these elements is contained in it, but it takes them all to do justice to the fulness of its meaning. Schleiermacher, to make religion independent of philosophy, interprets it as a feeling of absolute dependence. Still better, the author thinks, is R. Otto's explanation: it is the autonomous activity of the human spirit in his felt relation to an absolutely unique Being. This relation evokes in us the sense of the Holy, the "numinous" (the "altogether other"). We feel it to be a mysterium tremendum et fascinosum. Adoration is the final end of religion. Religion is not mainly belief about religion but a feeling response and activity response to the "Holy". It posits God as the ultimate ground and source of our human ideals.

Is, then, such religious experience valid? Ritschl (following Lotze) stresses its value character. It has value for the religious individual. He is not to worry about its theoretical factuality. Of this, says the writer, so much is true that religious experience can only be made by people having religious interest, but ultimate correlation of all experience in one world view must be our goal.

In reviewing the philosophical systems of the day, the author begins with Naturalism. It stands for the conviction that the physical and tangible world which interacts with our bodies is veritable reality, beyond which human thought cannot and need not pass. It goes without saying that religion cannot make terms with this view. Many

men of first rate caliber in the scientific world, like Jeans, Eddington and Whitehead, have borne witness that crass naturalism and materialism are positions that can no longer be held. But however welcome these views are, it must be admitted that natural science does not lead up necessarily to a full spiritual and theistic view of the universe.

The author's preference is with Idealism, which explains the universe in terms of ideas, reality as spiritual and mental. Absolute idealism (Hegel) of course, fails to do justice to the personality of God. It safeguards the universal side of personality but not the individual. The ultimate truth and significance of the universe is better guarded in Idealism than in any form of Naturalism. The kind of Idealism the writer contends for is Personal Idealism; the ultimate Reality must be conceived as personal. In the second part of the book which deals with the Christian conception of God, this personal Idealism receives lucid treatment.

But are we correct in thinking that our highest values throw light on ultimate Reality? We must think of the divine, he says, after the analogy of that which is richest in human life. We project such ideal human values as love and truth to the ultimate ground of things. We see that the author never claims to be able to *demonstrate* that the personal category must logically be applied to the divine. All we can do is to work up a strong case of *analogy.* As the personal is the highest category in the world around us so it seems reasonable to look for personality back of the universe. And since personality is the highest level reached by the evolutionary process, it is legitimate to infer that there are personality-producing forces back of the process. He quotes a significant word of Aristotle: The last term in the evolutionary process best reveals the nature of its first principle. Still, can we demand of the universe that it should tune itself to our liking? His answer is that the universal values impose themselves as norms to which we ought to conform. He thinks here of the ethical element in the human values and the reference to Kant's categorical imperative is evident. All our highest values, he continues, are the pulsation of the divine in us. The order of nature and the order of values are not self-contradictory and mutually exclusive circles but are complementary aspects of the universe. The theistic hypothesis is the most adequate and illuminating we know. We refuse to believe in the ultimate irrationality of things.

In the second part of the book we have a most enlightening discussion of the directly Christian position. The Christian conception of God, his fatherhood and sovereignty, his personality, God as Creator, providence, the divine attributes; then the doctrine of the Person of Christ, his incarnation, the relation of the divine and human, the Trinity (its religious essence and its metaphysical accretions): all these difficult questions are handled in a most masterly fashion.

The author's strong grasp on philosophy as well as on theology are matched by the clarity of his style and treatment. We have not met with an author so distinguished by his range of information, so fair in his dealing with opponents and so well grounded in the Chris-

tian faith, for a long time. The subject is naturally heavy and requires long-sustained thought. But if one is ready to spend time and effort on the study of the book he will find himself richly rewarded.

A Conservative Looks to Barth and Brunner. An Interpretation of Barthian Theology by *Holmes Rolston.* Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn. 1933, 220 pages, $1.50.

The books on Barth are multiplying on this side of the water. This is not strange when one considers what is said by responsible men on Barthianism. Thus John McConnachie (in "The Significance of Karl Barth") describes it as "the greatest spiritual movement of the century". Count Keyserling has remarked that the new movement is "saving Protestantism in Germany". Dr. Zerbe says, "It is an all-inclusive world-view, probably the most original and comprehensive, certainly the most revolutionary of recent times."

The author of this book is a young theologian, who has been deeply impressed with Barth and Brunner and finds them in harmony, on most questions, with conservative theology. Like all other students of the "dialectic" theology he emphasizes the difficulty of an adequate understanding. Since the qualitative difference between eternity and time is of the very essence of Barth's theology, it follows that all that is said by it about God and man and their relation, partakes of a brokenness that will never permit us to come to rest in a definite statement. There is the this-side and the yon-side, the divine and the human, the thesis and the anti-thesis, but it is impossible for the dialectic theology to find and offer a synthesis in which the contradictions find a solution. From this results the irritating preference of Barth for the *paradox*, in which he almost outdoes Kierkegaard, thereby chasing away many a one who would otherwise be glad to be initiated into the new teaching.

Barth's theology goes from God to man, not from man to God. The things of God can be known only as they are revealed by the Spirit to those who have yielded their lives to God. Jesus calls himself the light of the world and "he that *followeth* me shall not walk in darkness but shall have the light . . ." The knowledge is not given to the spectator or detached observer. Only through surrender can man enter into the knowledge of the truth which Christ brings.

Modernism thinks of Scripture as a record of man's experiences with God. The Barthians think of it as the witness to God's revelation of himself. Modernism thinks (in speaking of Christ) of an apotheosis of man, the Barthians think of an Incarnation of God. Barth puts the heaviest stress on the transcendence of God. The God of modernism, he says, is based on the reduction of God to a mere ideal, man's highest insights and values. Such a God is not really personal. The existence of God becomes a reality to man when God speaks to him. The traditional arguments for the existence of God yield thoughts about God but they do not bring us to the God who speaks to us in the Bible.

Barth is a strong contender for the revelation character of the Word of God. To the author of our book he yields too much to the Bible critic. In saying the Bible is not only the infallible Word of God but also the word of fallible man, he seems to contradict himself. We must hold fast, so says Mr. Rolston, to the integrity and reliability of the whole Bible. To Barth, however, only that is Word of God which the Holy Spirit authenticates to the believer.

In his Christology Barth offers the very strongest resistance to liberal theology, which makes Jesus the teacher and example only. He attacks the tendency of the "Jesus of history" school which claims that the enthusiasm of the first disciples made of Jesus a God while he was only a God-inspired man.

All theologians will in a way admit that the Cross occupies a central position in the Christian faith in so far as it shows Jesus was willing to suffer for his mission and that his followers must be ready to bear the cross. Barth, however, insists that Christ made an objective atonement for the sins of the world and that he could only do so because he was divine.

The writer praises Barth for upholding *theology*, that is under such disparagement today. The liberal will say, Not doctrine but life, not dogma but practice. Barth replies, "I have recovered from the children's disease of being ashamed of theology." To us it is more important to know who Jesus was than what he taught. He is a Savior, not only an inspiring teacher. Therefore be glad if you have a theology that does justice to your Redeemer.

We cannot enter into the discussion of the next chapters which deal with Barth's position on ethics, society and history. Here his position has been found unsatisfactory by many. He emphasizes the necessity of a moral dynamic for the new life and finds it in the Reformers' great doctrine of justification by faith.

As to the other great interests in life, science, art, education, social readjustment, Barth demands that religion be made the center of all human activities, the unifying element against the modern tendency of making them autonomous. Barth's outlook for the future is decidedly eschatological. The "kingdom" will not come by our endeavor but in God's own time and by his grace.

The book ought to be heartily welcomed because it makes its contribution to the clarifying of admittedly dark features in the Barthian theology. It discusses its organizing principles and chief teachings with ability and fairness and will be found helpful by the growing number of those who want to come to grips with a movement that can no longer be passed by even in our country.

We have quoted only Barth, but Brunner with his easier style and power of orderly statement is an important interpreter of the Barthian theology.

Theological Magazine

OF THE

EVANGELICAL SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA

Volume 61 November, 1933 Number 6

ELMHURST COLLEGE LIBRARY
ELMHURST, ILL.

Motto: 1. Cor. 3, 22-23.

Πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ.

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at Saint Louis, Missouri, as second-class matter in December, 1898.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 3, 1918.

Table of Contents for the Year 1933

November

	Page
Nationalism and Religion, Prof. Menzel	401
The Pulpit of Yesterday and Today, F. W. Schroeder	410
The Preacher as Scholar, A. J. Munsterman	417
Missionary Strategy, Dr. A. Stueler	422
Der Chriſt und die ſtaatliche Gemeinſchaft. Dr. Grützmacher	427
Schranken des Unionsprinzips. Dr. Schuetze	434
Deutſche Kultur. Dr. G. L. Scherger	439
Editorials	445
Christian World	453
Book Review	469

January

The Genius of the Reformed Church, by Dr. Geo. W. Richards	1
Sermon Sketches, by F. W. Schroeder	8
Christianity in a New Age, by Prof. Stanger	18
The Synod and the State, by Prof Schneider	28
Der Chriſt und die Freundſchaft. Prof. Dr. Grützmacher	31
Das ſoziale Chriſtentum. Dr. Schuetze	38
The Christian World	55
Editorials	48
Book Review	70

March

The Non-Christian Religions, Prof. Theo. Menzel	81
The Apostolic Creed, W. Bechtold	88
The Lord's Prayer, P. David	99
Der Chriſt und die Wiſſenſchaft. Prof. Grützmacher	106
Das Alte Teſtament. Dr. C. Schieler	114
Editorials	123
Christian World	131
Book Reviews	148

Continued on Page 3 of Cover

Continued from Page 2 of Cover

May

	Page
Modern Trends in Religious Education, Prof. H. C. Pflug	161
Depression and the Pastor, Tom Clare, M.A.	170
Sermon Sketches, A. H. Knipping	176
Der Christ und die Arbeit. Prof. Grützmacher	188
Pessimismus und Optimismus. Dr. C. Schieler	195
Neue „soziale Ideale." Dr. Schuetze	203
Editorials	211
Christian World	218
Book Review	230

July

Barthianism, Rev. M. Manrodt, Th.M.	241
World Redemption, Rev. C. Loos	250
Social Gospel Preaching, Rev. W. Rest	257
The Proposed Name, Rev. J. H. Steger	264
Die Lage in Deutschland. Dr. O. Dibelius	267
Der Christ und die soziale Frage. Dr. Grützmacher	272
Spinoza. Dr. C. Schieler	279
Editorials	288
Christian World	299
Book Review	311

September

Belief in God, Rev. Robert C. Stanger	321
The Denominational College, Rev. A. S. Susott	330
Missionary Strategy, Dr. A. Stueler	338
Confirmation Instruction, H. Kamphausen	345
Der Christ und die staatliche Gemeinschaft. Prof. Dr. Grützmacher	352
Gedanken über Faust. Dr. C. Schieler	359
Editorials	372
The Christian World	380
Book Review	390